

borers' Union of America, Nashville, Ill., Charles Wilkey, Jr., secretary, urging Congress to adopt the Townsend plan as proposed in House bill 2; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1101. By Mr. SHANLEY: Petition of Russell Council, No. 65, of the Knights of Columbus, New Haven, Conn., concerning the embargo on Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1102. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Resolution passed by both the Assembly and Senate of the California State Legislature, urging the Secretary of Labor of the United States to settle the existing uncertainties as to the citizenship status of the said Harry Bridges without further delay, by making a full report upon this subject to the President and to the Congress of the United States, and to instigate in the matter such appropriate action, if any, as may be indicated to be proper by the findings set forth in such report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1103. Also, resolution unanimously adopted by the members of the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police, at a regular meeting held at the courthouse, Newark, N. J., February 2, 1939, urging that the Dies committee be authorized to continue the activities and investigations heretofore accomplished, and that said committee may be given not only necessary financial aid to efficiently carry out this great work but that it should also receive the patriotic approval and support of the American people to the end that these persons, interests, and groups whose efforts and desires are designed to promote discord, impair the efficiency of our Government, to create class hatred, or to do any and all which are inimical to the best interests of the people and Government of the United States, shall be destroyed or driven from our shores; to the Committee on Rules.

1104. Also, letter from John A. Logan Council, No. 6, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y., commending the good work of Congressman J. PARNELL THOMAS in regard to the investigation of Secretary of Labor Perkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1105. Also, resolution of Dupage County executive committee, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, endorsing the demand of the national commander of the American Legion that the Secretary of Labor be impeached for causes incident to the failure to deport Communist Harry Bridges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1106. Also, letter from H. L. Harms, commander, Santa Barbara Post, No. 49, American Legion, Department of California, with a membership of 800 World War veterans, congratulating Congressman J. PARNELL THOMAS for courageous action in bringing impeachment proceedings against the Secretary of Labor and her aids for their absolute neglect of their constitutional oath by protecting convicted aliens who are illegally in this country and who advocate the overthrow of our country by violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1107. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of the Fort Fetter Post, No. 516, Hollidaysburg, Pa., American Legion, favoring the construction of a canal across Nicaragua, so as to permit protecting our shores on both oceans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1108. By Mr. WELCH: Joint Resolution No. 10 of the California State Assembly, relative to Federal appropriations for relief in California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1109. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Medical Association, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Army Medical Library and Museum at Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1110. Also, petition of the American Indian Federation, Miami, Okla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to un-American activities in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

1111. Also, petition of the Aviation Defense Association, Inc., Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Aviation Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1112. Also, petition of Jesies Ramos, Bayamon, P. R., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1113. Also, petition of C. W. Caylor, of Empire, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1114. Also, petition of C. E. Cook, of Denai, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1939

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious Father, we praise Thee that the light of another day has broken on our mortal vision. Duties await us; responsibilities are upon us. May the words of our mouth and the meditations of our heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the morning press carries the account of the meeting of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor at Miami, Fla., on yesterday, at which time they issued what is to my mind a momentous statement on the economic conditions of the country. The American Federation of Labor, long a potent factor in advancing the cause of the workers of America, represents the great conservative opinion of American labor. The statement of Mr. Green representing the council follows hereafter. I was particularly impressed with his statement that it is the duty of the Government to remove "fear, lack of confidence, and distrust from the path of industrial expansion." Also the statement "we cannot accept the reasoning of those who maintain that we must prepare to maintain constantly an army of unemployed as the wards of the Government." Mr. Speaker, this statement coming from the ranks of labor is significant. It is also fundamentally true.

In line with this sentiment, I take the liberty of quoting from a speech I made in the House of Representatives on April 4, 1938, when the House had under consideration the reorganization bill. I quote a brief paragraph from that speech:

Increased costs of Government mean an added burden to every citizen of our land from the highest to the humblest. Every workman bending under the burden of the costs of living; every housewife as she goes to market; every farmer as he strives to overcome a disjointed economic order, pays tribute to the tax gatherer as he passes among us to collect his toll. Nothing we could do would so quickly bring back confidence and start anew the wheels of progress as to make a real serious effort to set our financial house in order. Nothing we could do would bring such a sense of security to our workers as to reassure business and industry that we meant what we said about reducing the burdensome costs of Government.

Events which have transpired since the date of this speech convinces me that nothing we can do would be so helpful to American labor as to set about seriously to stabilize our economic conditions so that the workers would be called back to

regular and permanent employment and not be forced to rely for their daily bread upon a hand-out from the Government. The statement of the American Federation of Labor executive council is, in part, as follows:

We are firmly convinced that various forms of Government spending, either in the distribution of relief or in the development and maintenance of work projects designed to supply relief wages to unemployed, can only serve as temporary measures and cannot and do not provide a permanent solution for unemployment.

The market for the sale of goods and services can be increased and enlarged only through the application of a sound, economic policy whereby there is placed in the hands of the masses of the people a buying power which will enable them to buy, use, and consume the manufactured goods and services which private industry is prepared to supply.

This leads to the inevitable conclusion that private industry and business generally should be stimulated so that the facilities of production may be increased and millions more working men and women may be employed.

What can be done and what should be done, therefore, are the problems which, at the moment, call for consideration and a proper solution. We do not believe that the Nation has reached the maximum in production or consumption of manufactured goods. For that reason we cannot accept the reasoning of those who maintain that we must prepare to maintain constantly an army of unemployed as the wards of the Government. We must turn to private industry for the solution. It should and must serve the Nation. Our national interests require that private industry be accorded the widest opportunity to do so. Obviously, the next step must be the establishment of credit and the will and purpose, on the part of the owners of industry, to risk, invest, build, and construct. The basis for such procedure must be found in the creation of a favorable state of mind. Fear, a lack of confidence, and distrust in governmental, social, and economic procedure, should be removed. A political and economic state of mind should be created which would enable all financiers and the owners and management of industry to face the future with confidence, willing to risk in the expenditure of funds for the development of industrial enterprises and in the manufacture and sale of manufactured products. * * *

Some strong, powerful, and influential representatives of private industry maintain that in order that private enterprise may go forward it is necessary that the rules and laws under which industry should operate should be more definite, clear, and understandable. * * *

The executive council is firmly of the opinion that this issue should be met squarely. All should understand that no new rules or stipulations will be promulgated by some administrative bureau other than the rules and regulations definitely set forth in regulatory statutes enacted by the Congress of the United States. Such action will serve to help business, labor, and the people generally. Under such a plan industrial management would be accorded the widest opportunity to render service in the solution of our unemployment problem.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it is with distinct pride, as well as with an appreciation of responsibility, that I rise on this occasion to pay tribute to a great American woman—Susan B. Anthony.

It is not necessary for us to ask what it is that makes a nation great, or what makes America outstanding among the nations of the world. It is not, after all, her enormous and hidden wealth. It is not her landscapes—beautiful and attractive as they may be. It is not her cities, with towering skyscraper buildings, or the immense industries that she has builded. It is not alone her schools or her institutions of learning, that prove the advancement we have made in our civilization. These are of vast importance—but, in addition to these, and of still more significance—America is great because of the splendid record of her noble men and women who have given—yes, even sacrificed—their lives for their country, which we call our own.

In each generation, there are certain men and women who stand out among the mass of our people—men and women who not only have more than ordinary talents—but who are willing and eager to use those talents and sacrifice their very lives in order to give their country and the world certain outstanding contributions that will live through generations to come.

And so today we honor the memory of a great woman. Not alone because she was an illustrious character. Not so

much because of her unusual talents, and not only because of the principles which she advocated—but also because of certain basic concepts and beliefs to which she adhered and ever remained steadfast.

Susan B. Anthony was born in Adams, Mass., of Quaker parentage, on February 15, 1820. She was nurtured and reared in the atmosphere of those surroundings, and impressed with the homely virtues of right thinking, right living, thrift, and industry. She had the advantage of a thorough education in accordance with the conditions of the times, and she made the very best possible use of her training. After her graduation, she became a teacher in the schools, and as a young woman—she determined to give her life to champion the cause of woman's rights.

From that time until her death at the age of 87 years—she worked unceasingly for the cause of woman's suffrage. Many books could be written about her half century of pioneering amidst persecution for the emancipation of women, and her crusade for the equal rights amendment to the Constitution, which was proclaimed the law of the land more than 50 years later.

I think it is not unfair for me to digress for a moment, to express appreciation on behalf of the people of my State of Kansas, for the influence of this great woman who came to our commonwealth when Kansas was in its infancy. Miss Anthony spent a considerable amount of time in Kansas. She lectured there in the very days of our statehood. She lived there for a while. Her brother was one of our outstanding Governors. Another brother was one of our early and leading editors. Her nephew represented one of our Kansas districts in this Congress in later years. And so, as a Kansan, I am especially proud of having a part in paying tribute to her this afternoon.

Susan B. Anthony appeared on the horizon at a time when the cause she championed was not only unpopular among men but among women as well. It was for her to kindle the spark of public opinion in favor of the cause of woman suffrage. It is said that public opinion is the greatest factor in America, and when it is refined by the fire of full and free discussion it becomes a wholesome expression of the views of the people.

Susan B. Anthony was encouraged by meeting obstacles and overcoming them. She was strengthened in her cause by her disappointments. For half a century she fought what appeared to be a losing battle. She died at the age of 87 years, seeing her cause only partly achieved, but sincerely believing that righteousness would triumph in the minds of men and women.

And so today we are honored on this occasion by paying tribute to a great woman who belongs with the history makers of this Republic. While she did not begin or end woman's struggle toward equality with man she left upon the whole movement the stamp of her imperishable personality. America is different, is ennobled and enriched, because of the indelible influence of her great character. We honor ourselves today in honoring this distinguished woman. Her life was dedicated to a splendid public service. She is exemplified in the beautiful thought that—

We live in deeds, not years,
In thoughts, not breaths,
In feelings, not in figures on a dial,
We should count time by heart throbs.
He lives most who thinks most,
Feels the noblest—acts the best.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a sworn statement made at Scotts Bluff, Nebr., regarding the amount of money paid per day to beet growers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein an address of the vice president of the Senate of Puerto Rico regarding the last 5 years of the economic life of Puerto Rico under Governor Winship.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record by including therein a letter from a constituent regarding the interest rates charged veterans on Government insurance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE MEANINGFUL STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, while Congress weighs the impregnability of our shores and looks to our national defenses, it is by an odd and evil twist of fate that a famous member of the Metropolitan Opera Co. should arrive in Washington and declare that the words of our national anthem are meaningless to our people.

As the echo of marching feet, the drone of fighting planes, and the cries of persecuted minorities roll across the Atlantic from dictator nations to our free shores, it is shocking to learn that an American citizen finds no meaning in those sacred words:

'Tis the star-spangled banner: oh, long may it wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The man credited with the outburst of feeling against The Star-Spangled Banner is Frederick Jagel, American-born tenor, who is appearing in Washington tonight to sing the title role in Lohengrin.

His philosophy is quoted in yesterday's Washington Times-Herald as follows:

The words of that song—it's really not a song but a "glee" written for three voices—mean nothing to an American. They were written on the inspiration of a battle.

And we, in our great land, have no need to glorify battle. * * *

The average person does not know the words of our anthem—and little wonder.

The reason for this is that the words mean nothing in our daily life. * * *

Thus an American opera star, who received considerable of his training in the dictator countries, vociferates nefariously against something near and dear to every school child in the land.

I can take Tenor Jagel into the Eight Congressional District of Michigan, which I represent, where 95 percent of the people, including their Congressman, have never witnessed an opera, and give him a visual lesson on the meaning that song has to those red-blooded citizens.

I can take him to any public school in my district, any Grange hall, church, town building, or other public meeting place, and show him a thrill in those words "This be our motto, 'In God is our trust,' and the star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave," not to be found or compared to anything in Lohengrin, even at \$3.30 per head, which people will pay to hear Mr. Jagel tonight.

Mr. Jagel may be famed for hitting the high notes in Aida or La Boheme, but he has struck a new low note in disrespect for an anthem that has thrilled Americans for a century and a quarter, if he made the statement published.

From the lips of a country schoolmaster I learned that The Star-Spangled Banner was written to glorify a victory and the glorious sight of the stars and stripes waving in the sunlight following a jittery and desperate night in which the future of the Nation hung in the balance.

Furthermore, this opera star appears to be distressed by the fact this famous poem is sung to the tune of a song made famous by a club founded in a London coffee house half a century before the British raid on Baltimore's Fort McHenry. Numerous contradictory claims have been made, but, granting it to be the case, shall we likewise discard our laws because they are founded on old English laws?

Whose tune was used when music was applied to the historic poem is beside the point, for it appears that by common consent Americans adopted that particular arrangement of musical notes and have applied them lustily in proclaiming to the world their pride in The Star-Spangled Banner for many, many decades. The musical arrangement is not the worst part of Mr. Jagel's complaint.

The resolvable phase of his utterance is the implication the words of the song are meaningless.

With the crumbled ruins of tottered democracies strewn on the face of the earth today, place yourself in a position similar to that of Francis Scott Key in a night of anguish during which you knew not whether the morrow would find your land of freedom manacled once again by a foreign power or whether out of the confusion would come some symbol that bravery prevailed and that the Nation was preserved.

Feel the thrill that coursed the veins of Francis Scott Key when time reached the threshold of dawn on that memorable day and he and members of his party strained their eyes to peer through the fog suddenly to see the first beam of sunlight flash on our flag waving above those ramparts so gallantly defended. Would you still say these are meaningless words? Hardly so.

Mr. Speaker, to this proposal to streamline the national anthem may I affix a thousand times "no," and as for my choice between The Star-Spangled Banner and some other scheme of song proposed by the Metropolitan Opera star, give me the song inspired by Old Glory at Fort McHenry.

COMMITTEE ON WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignations from committees:

FEBRUARY 15, 1939.

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,

Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully submit my resignation as a member of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources.

Sincerely yours,

LEO E. ALLEN.

FEBRUARY 14, 1939.

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,

Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SPEAKER BANKHEAD: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT E. CARTER.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the authority conferred upon the Speaker by House Resolution 65 and House Resolution 90 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints the following minority Members of the House to fill the existing vacancies on the Special Committee on Wildlife Conservation: MESSRS. HOLMES, of Massachusetts; ANGELL, of Oregon; and KEEFE, of Wisconsin.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3791) to provide more effectively for the national defense by carrying out the recommendations of the President in his message of January 12, 1939, to the Congress.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3791, with Mr. BLAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss just one or two features of this bill in the few minutes allotted to me. In the beginning I may say I am heartily in favor of this entire measure as it is written. I believe it is a wholly helpful and needed plan, a conservative program for affording to the United States an adequate national defense.

It has been mentioned in the debate here that as the bill was originally introduced it provided for an authorization of

6,000 planes, and that this figure was later cut to an authorization of 5,500 planes. That is true. The original bill did provide an authorization of 6,000 planes, but when the officials of the War Department testified before our committee and showed that the entire program was pitched upon an authorization of 5,500 planes, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] offered an amendment cutting the authorized strength to 5,500, and that amendment was supported unanimously by the committee. I do not recall that there was a single dissenting vote.

Something has been said here about the failure of The Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Johnson, to testify before our committee, and some intimation has been made that he had advocated a much larger number of planes. I have followed rather closely the newspaper accounts relating to this program; I have followed the speeches that have been made, particularly by Mr. Johnson, relating to this program; I have talked with Mr. Johnson about this program, and I have seen mimeographed copies of his speeches, and I do not believe anyone can point out any speech Mr. Johnson ever made in which any number as large as 10,000 or any other number larger than what we are authorizing in this program was referred to by him.

The first time Mr. Johnson spoke on this program was at a meeting at some point in New England which I do not now recall. In this speech—and I have seen later speeches in which he has repeated the same thought—he said that in order to give us an adequate defense in the air it would be necessary to increase greatly our present air strength. He said it would be necessary to double our air strength, triple it, or perhaps even quadruple it. If we should quadruple our air strength, which is the very maximum he set, we would not have as many as 6,000 first-class fighting planes under this program, and that is the very extreme prediction that Mr. Johnson or, as far as I know, any representative of the War Department, has ever made in regard to our air-defense program.

This authorization is not for an extravagant number of planes. It is a conservative number, and I may say that this program should not be restricted by any such amendment as is proposed by the minority. If I read that amendment aright, it means that our Government would not be authorized to contract for more than 1,000 planes in any one year.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. If the amendment was adopted, the Government would be able to contract during the first year for 2,022 planes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That includes those that are already on order or proposed to be ordered out of the regular appropriation.

Mr. ANDREWS. But they would, within 1 year, contract for more than 2,000 planes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the first year?

Mr. ANDREWS. That is right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But as I read the amendment it states that for the fiscal year 1939 and 1940, in addition to those under order now or those that will be under order for the first fiscal year, not more than 1,000 airplanes may be contracted for during any one fiscal year except in the event of a declaration of an emergency.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman is quite correct. Actually, as it would work out, it would mean we would only be restricted to ordering 1,000 planes during the 2 years following this year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct; in other words, you propose, as I understand, to spread the program over 3 years, but what are you going to do about the obsolete planes you are going to have to throw out during that period and those that are washed out or destroyed in crashes? Your 1,000 would certainly include that number and would not be an adequate authorization.

Mr. ANDREWS. If the gentleman reads section 1 carefully, he will see that is provided for in another provision of the section.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, but under your proposed amendment you are specifically limiting the contract during any one fiscal year to 1,000 planes.

Anyhow, be that as it may, that is a matter of difference of opinion between the majority side and the minority side, and it is about the only point, as I understand it, in controversy in this program.

I now want to take just a few minutes to discuss one item in this bill and to say that I am happy to see it included, and that is the proposal to spend \$27,000,000 on our Panama defenses. Of this sum, \$23,500,000 is to be used for construction and \$3,500,000 for subsistence, equipment, maintenance, and transportation.

It was my good fortune to be able to visit Panama during the past summer and to have an opportunity to visit and inspect the various installations there. I was greatly interested in them, but I was astonished to find a condition that I considered absolutely deplorable in any defense set-up of the United States. I found, first of all, to my surprise, that there was a wholly inadequate road network; that there is no road crossing the Isthmus; that we have a great many guns, searchlights, and other installations placed out in the jungle that during the rainy season, extending from May to December, are absolutely inaccessible except to men on foot. In some instances these men would have to struggle for hours to get up these trails in order to carry gasoline to operate the motors necessary to keep the equipment in good shape, and in some instances the installations actually had to be removed prior to the onset of the rainy season, due to the fact that it would not be possible to get to them to give them the care and attention that is necessary to keep them in good condition during the rainy season.

I am pleased to note that this program provides some funds for the building of this road network which is absolutely necessary for the adequate defense of this key defense possession of the United States. In time of peace the highly necessary routine of service to the anti-aircraft defense installations during the wet season is seriously hindered. Servicing parties struggle on foot for hours through the mud, carrying gasoline and oil to reach an installation which could be reached in minutes were the road hard-surfaced. In time of emergency it is even more essential that the defenses be quickly accessible, not only for immediate defense purposes but also for the supplying of food and equipment and the possible evacuation of the wounded. The vital anti-aircraft defenses of the Panama Canal department should be rescued from the mud.

I found housing conditions that I could not believe existed anywhere in the Army of the United States. I found millions of dollars worth of property housed in buildings that are nothing but firetraps. I found double-deck bunking in that tropical country not suitable for the Tropics. I found men living in tents the year round, using old, discarded railroad cars for dining rooms and kitchens. I found employees of the Army living in buildings that had been found unfit for the employees of the Panama Canal and had been condemned for use by them, and yet our Army employees were living in those buildings. I found in one of the Army posts 111 men living in a building that had a capacity of 88, and in another one I found 88 men living in a building with a capacity of only 52. At one place I found 179 men with only 10 washbasins and mirrors to service all of those men and with only 16 toilet stools. There were narrow stairways, and only a few years ago a man was killed trying to get out of the building when we had an earthquake tremor. Companies have to feed in double shifts because of lack of space. This condition is more or less typical in several of the posts in that key defense position. I am glad to see some relief given to these conditions that today exist in Panama.

There is just one other thing I want to mention, and this program falls far short of it. This, to my way of thinking, is not a complete program. Out of all this money only six and a half million dollars is provided for our seacoast defense; and should the time ever come when our Navy is cut off from the Atlantic or from the Pacific seaboard, and the Panama Canal should be endangered or should be closed,

then our other seacoast as it exists today will be practically defenseless. I believe our program will not have been completed until a much larger and more adequate provision is made for our seacoast defenses and our harbor defenses, where heavy guns and antiaircraft material and personnel are needed. Great metropolitan areas, such as the city of New York, for instance, find themselves today defended by nothing more than what amounts to a corporal's guard—simply caretakers of our guns in our harbor defenses. Six and a half million dollars is simply a start, and is far short of an adequate program in providing necessary equipment for these posts and for these defenses, to say nothing of the increased personnel that will be required to build these defenses up to what they ought to be. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, again my position on the Committee on Expenditures of the Government serves as a slight excuse for my entering the discussion. No one wishes to oppose this bill, but the minority advises that a reasonable approach to the problem be made and has given you such good reasons therefor that you should go along with them, I am sure. This discussion has been unusually harmonious. I said recently that the best rampart is a sound Treasury and that a vast public debt is not a good rampart for national defense. To spend money unnecessarily or unadvisedly is wrong. To build a great many planes at \$50,000 each that will so soon become obsolete and saddle upon ourselves the maintenance of them is not good sense. I asked the question yesterday of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] whether the specifications of any plane yet owned by a foreign nation are such that they could come over here, bomb our shores, and return home again. He said, "Of course, not"; and we all know that. So we should not become hysterical as to any immediate danger. I asked him again why these planes are being built and whether it was possible that we were building them to sell to France and England. Evidently that will be the place where they will be used. He said in effect, "I believe that France and England should buy as many planes as they desire if they will put the cash on the barrel head." He approved of that. I think many so approve, but perhaps we had better not say so. There are very weird stories abroad today about our foreign policy.

I do not suppose that what a mere Congressman says would amount to anything. The President determines our foreign policy, and the blustering Ickes, representing the President, may also supposedly have an inkling as to what that foreign policy is. But we are still kept in the dark. As far as France and England are concerned, perhaps we, in our deep sympathy for democracies, fully endorse what the gentleman from Texas says. I did not ask him, because I feared he did not want to yield further, and I did not wish to embarrass him, but I did want to ask if he thought we ought to sell to Germany, in the event that Germany also put the cash on the barrel head. What do you suppose he would have said?

In view of what has been said and written, lately, of course it may have been only a phrase maker who said that our frontier probably is the Rhine. But he was no "boob." It was an apt phrase and can hardly be criticized, especially since it served to bring the whole situation to the attention of the country. And when the epithet "liar" was hurled at United States Senators, that was an example of petulance deserving of notice, and a cause for anxiety over the state of mind in high places. We recall that the press was exonerated and finally the leak or misconception was placed at the door of the United States Senators.

Like the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN], who said the other day that he sometimes likes to take a ringside seat and laugh his head off, I was similarly affected, yesterday I wanted to laugh my head off when the gentleman from Massachusetts, my friend, Mr. McCORMACK, tried to justify the withholding of information that at least could have been presented to the great Committee on Ways and Means by a com-

mittee of their own advisers, highly able, highly paid, to whom they usually turn for advice. Do not tell me that they did not know that advice was ready for them, or I shall indeed laugh my head off. So strange that so many knew it several days before. After months of study, how suddenly the report appears for use in another body!

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] in his admirable address yesterday, said no one had been before the Military Affairs Committee to explain, or touch upon, our foreign policy. No one apparently knows what it is. But perhaps that is an incorrect statement as we can now guess fairly well what that foreign policy is. It would, of course, be unwise to have it stated since the lack of a statement thereof may be our real safety. Of course we do not actually know, but from what we read and hear we have a right to assume what our foreign policy is to be. Actions speak much louder than words, and when we have no definite statement of policy we must form our opinion, and certainly can assume what it is when asked to vote large sums for military operations.

We heard some months ago that certain nations ought to be quarantined. Those are fighting words. They cannot be forgotten. Certain nations have abused us roundly since that utterance. When we show eagerness to sell airplanes to democracies, and unwillingness to sell to totalitarian nations, the inference is dreadfully plain that we may be willing to ally ourselves with countries with which our leaders are in sympathy, and that we are about to entangle ourselves by such procedure. We do not say so, but our actions point to it. There is certainly not a lack of suspicion that our neutrality policy, which we adopted, is gradually being undermined in order that the President may name the aggressor, and the victim, and thereby prepare our people for what he has termed "practical" assistance.

Accumulation of expressed opinions will lead us to a point where we can safely assume the policy desired by the administration. We may well assume that these planes we will now build are not to meet any enemy planes which could not reach our shores, but that they may be extremely useful to our friends, even if a little later, for that would be only one step further, they would be unable to put the cash on the barrel head.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield. I wish to yield. Shed some light on this, will you?

Mr. MAY. I just wanted to ask the gentleman, in addition to agreeing with him on the question that France and England should put the cash on the barrel—

Mr. GIFFORD. Did I say I agree to that?

Mr. MAY. I think you said you were in favor of their putting the cash on the barrel. I would like to ask the gentleman if he objects to their rehabilitating our idle plants by giving them business, and paying cash for it?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, my deep sympathy is for democracies; but I am not saying so, and you ought not say so. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman know for certain that we are getting cash on the barrel head for the planes that have been sold? There has been nothing brought to my attention that indicates for certain that we are.

Mr. GIFFORD. No. I cannot vouch for that, but I have the word of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] that if the cash is on the barrel, it will be all right.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Is it not a fact that we are exporting airplanes, engines, and so on, war machinery of different sorts, and we are importing all agricultural products? Is not that true?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, of course, it is true. The whole situation on all fronts, under the guidance of this New Deal party, has gone haywire. At this time I want to remind you that on that side of the House not a single so-called

conservative Democrat has this year ventured to take the floor in opposition to the criticisms and attacks and the lesson of the last election. They have been sufficiently baited. It has been left for two or three of your enthusiastic new dealers to defend indefensible Presidential appointments and party policies. Oh, why so reticent? It is so unlike last session's hilarity. I often speak for you, because you lack willingness to speak. You agree with me so perfectly, I do appreciate it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I have a great deal of confidence in the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. How about your President? Have you not confidence in him, too?

Mr. MASSINGALE. Yes. I have confidence in him, and I have confidence in you. I believe you are frank and that is the reason I am asking you this question.

Mr. GIFFORD. It is strange I should ever be reelected, is it not? Probably too much frankness.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I do not know your constituency, but I should think they would show good judgment in sending you back here.

Mr. GIFFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MASSINGALE. The question I wanted to ask is this: The gentleman is criticizing, indirectly, the sale of airplanes to France by our manufacturers.

Mr. GIFFORD. Was I?

Mr. MASSINGALE. What I want to know is, what is the gentleman's idea of the moral distinction, if any, between selling airplanes to France and selling scrap iron and other war materials to Japan?

Mr. GIFFORD. Why, the gentleman is bringing his own indictment; is he not?

Mr. MASSINGALE. Well, I am asking you the question.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, the gentleman has suggested his own criticism. He now brings to your attention the fact that we have sold perhaps 10 times as much scrap iron as formerly to Japan to murder Chinese, when his sympathy is probably with the Chinese as the victims, rather than with the Japanese, the aggressors. The gentleman does not need me to enlarge upon that. I thank the gentleman for the suggested criticism.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Many people in the United States feel that England is a Shylock. They resent the fact that England is supreme on the seas, yet they ignore the fact that through the expenditure of billions of dollars on the British Navy the British have given the people of the United States much security. My question is: In the event certain dictator nations in Europe went to war with England and sank the British Navy, or took it over, what effect would that have on the security of the people in the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman does not need to ask me or anybody else that. I know, living where I do, that our coast defenses need airplanes. I am glad to vote for this bill. We are simply criticizing the number and the amount that may be manufactured each year. We know what, if England were overcome, our danger might possibly be, but that is not an immediate danger. Does the gentleman think it is?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I was asking the gentleman that question.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am unable to visualize that as an immediate danger. When I vote for this bill it will be taking a reasonable attitude. I am depressed and shocked when I think of the vast sums that have already been expended considering the results attained. Under permission to extend my remarks I shall set forth further facts in this regard for I have them here; large sums spent yearly and culminating this coming year in an expenditure of \$1,600,-

000,000. During the blank-check period for the W. P. A. purposes, notice the large sums diverted by the President from relief funds for the Military Establishment:

1933-34	\$540,356,000
1934-35	709,931,000
1935-36	921,684,000
1936-37	935,114,000
1937-38	1,027,841,000
1938-39	1,119,810,000
1939-40	1,668,283,000

Total 6,933,019,000

Each year the President has spent not merely the sums appropriated by Congress for national defense, but also many millions which he has allocated from recovery and relief funds. The amounts are very great. Here they are by years:

1933-34	\$60,663,000
1934-35	176,335,000
1935-36	147,246,000
1936-37	79,004,000
1937-38	53,735,000
1938-39	77,604,000
1939-40	50,726,000

Total 645,313,000

About these allocations two very significant features appear. First of all these are sums not appropriated by Congress, but appropriated by the President himself. Thus, in 1935, Congress appropriated \$553,596,000 for national defense. But Congress has been turning over to the President billions each year to spend as he likes. And in 1936 he appropriated another \$176,000,000 for national defense.

The gentleman who preceded me caused me to marvel at the facts he disclosed. Despite the huge expenditure of W. P. A. funds for housing he found it necessary to stand up here and indict the housing conditions of our Military Establishment as being so deplorable. What have they done with the money?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to answer the question asked by the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that in the event of that happening which he outlined in his question, the United States would have to take care of the British possessions. That is why we need a navy.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; but my time is running, so I ask the gentleman to be brief.

Mr. THILL. Does the gentleman know of any nation anywhere that might want to attack us in the near future?

Mr. GIFFORD. Certainly not. Hemmed in by potential enemies of their own, all of those "brigand nations," as Ickes calls them, have their hands full; economically they have their hands full. That they seek war with us is a ridiculous assumption. Our foreign policy at the moment is seemingly, indeed, a weird one. South America is probably the answer; Mexico, loving us so much, expropriating our properties, depends upon our silver policy and our Navy. But we have agreed to protect them. Mexico and Brazil, when they speak of the United States Navy, call it "our Navy." We know that we are building largely because of them. And I have read that "while we do not want to meddle in the affairs of Europe at the present time when she is so out of her senses, when she comes to her senses we shall need not meddle with her."

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. If the gentleman had had the power, would he have prevented the sale of the airplanes to France?

Mr. GIFFORD. I thought I told the gentleman that I have very deep sympathy with that operation, but I did not feel it was quite wise to go on record, either the gentleman or I, lest Hitler hear of it.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. I believe we should feel thankful that our airplane factories are of such outstanding character that France is willing to send her gold here for their airplanes.

Mr. GIFFORD. And I will ask the gentleman if he thinks it is a good idea to sell airplanes to Germany? Is he willing to sell them to Germany? The gentleman asked me a question; I now ask him one.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. No; I would not; I would not.

Mr. GIFFORD. It now appears that the party was no "boob" who said that the Rhine is our frontier.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. I do not regard Germany as being in the same category with England and France. I, as a Representative from a Western State, feel sorry for the fate I fear stands waiting for France and England, which may flow from the extremes to which the autocratic powers I fear will force her.

Mr. GIFFORD. The President is evidently being very successful in shaping the opinion of this House. His foreign policy is seemingly already meeting with approval.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I often speak seriously and frankly, as one gentleman has stated. Certainly I do not want to appear to be too critical, but I am, indeed, greatly worried about our own financial condition, especially our huge national debt. I feel that it is incumbent upon me to take the floor of this House often to portray this situation and comment on the consequences thereof. I dread to think of the constant stream of recommendations from our President to spend borrowed money. I had hoped we were getting away from extravagant expenditures.

I have for several years been greatly amused when he would thank Congress for its cooperation. It was not cooperation at all, it was submission, rubber-stamp business. [Laughter.] I thought it rather sarcastic to thank us for cooperation.

We must hesitate to enter into any foreign alliances although our sympathies may well go out to so-called democracies. In closing, having touched on our very costly needs and experiments, I would add a pleasantry—in making costly alliances when we are unable to meet our expenses, I offer the following: "I cannot marry you," he said, "because I am not making my expenses." She said, "Marry me and I will make plenty of expenses." [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE.]

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be helpful if we go back to school for a few minutes and study our history and geography. We have before us the pending bill. Next week we will have the Navy bill, which will be followed by the supply bills for the Army and Navy.

I want to preface my remarks by stating that I do not favor this Nation forming any entangling alliance with any other nation on earth; neither do I favor sending our boys to a foreign country to participate in a war. On that premise I want to address myself to the statement that we Americans are safe so long as England and France stand, and we will be in immediate danger should they fall.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct attention to this world map. Let me go back to 1918 and to the Versailles Treaty. Under this treaty Germany was compelled, according to the terms of peace, to yield every colonial or outlying possession. May I point out some of the territory that Germany surrendered? She surrendered this territory here in Africa [indicating on map]. She surrendered this section in Africa [indicating]. She surrendered this section in Africa [indicating] which she is raising Cain about now and the one she is most anxious about. She surrendered this section right in here just below Ethiopia [indicating]. More important than that, she surrendered these islands here,

which are now a mandate of the Japanese. You see this border line here [indicating]. She was required to surrender every island within this border except the island of Guam, of which you have heard so much today. All of these are under Japanese mandate [indicating]. Rumor has it that contrary to the mandate agreement, the Japanese have fortified one or two of these islands.

Mr. Chairman, this section over here in Europe [indicating] can be likened to a keg of dynamite, and several people have a match in their hand ready to light the keg.

We must remember that every implement of war which Germany has today is modern. All of the old materials were taken from them. Consequently, all of their guns and planes are up-to-date and modern. If Germany intends to strike, it is to its interest to strike soon, while it holds the mastery of the air and while it has such a well-equipped army. It is my candid judgment that Hitler is holding back today only for two reasons: One is to complete his submarines in order to handle the British shipping and the other is fear of the United States.

Here is the section that Mussolini right now is demanding [indicating]. At this time Germany maintains a plane service to South America. These planes leave here [indicating], and I am not sure but I think they go down to the Canary Islands under an agreement with Spain, land there, come across here [indicating], go down to Buenos Aires, come across, and go up here [indicating], gradually extending their line up to here [indicating].

Forget for a minute whether or not you like the President of the United States. Let us assume that war comes in Europe and that it comes sometime during the spring. Let us assume further that this time Germany and its allies are victorious. God forbid, but let us assume they should be. Mr. Chairman, do you not think that under these circumstances Germany would demand of England and France not only the return of its own colonial possessions but would also demand the surrender of many British and French possessions? Mark me, I began by saying that so long as England and France stand we are safe. The moment they fall we are in danger.

Let us assume that the terms of the next treaty will require exactly what England and France required of Germany. You see that dot right there [indicating]. It is 600 miles from our shores; it is the Bermuda Islands. You may say that you are not going to let Germany take over the Bermuda Islands, you would not let any hostile nation do that; but if Germany secures Bermuda under the terms of a treaty, it secures that possession in a peaceful manner, and when we dash over to keep Germany from taking possession of the Bermuda Islands we are the aggressor, are we not?

Here is another point over here [indicating] right off the coast of Florida, the Bahama Islands belonging to Great Britain. There is a little section over here in Central America, Honduras, which belongs to Britain. There is British Guiana in South America. There is French Guiana in South America. Well, you say, no unfriendly nation will take those, because we will not let them. I do not think we will, either. But that is war, is it not? I ask the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts now, in connection with the discussion involving the question of the sale of planes to England and France, is it not better that we sell England and France for cash the planes they need for their defense than for ourselves to go to war with whoever is the conqueror in the event England and France should go down?

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman makes the point of France and Great Britain against Germany. What happened in connection with the Czechoslovakian business, at the time of the Munich Conference? Did not France and England then have an opportunity to demonstrate their love for democracy? What happened?

Mr. PACE. I may say to the gentleman I do not think they had the opportunity, for this reason: Here is Czechoslovakia over here [indicating]. The attitude of Russia was

unknown. England and France in order to get to Czechoslovakia would have to cross over Germany, and all they could furnish were planes. At that time, as well as at the present time, Germany had 10,000 modern planes.

England had probably 1,500 modern planes and France about 500. What chance does the gentleman believe England and France would have had to aid Czechoslovakia with 2,000 planes crossing over a country with 10,000 planes? The evidence is that England and France would not have had a plane in the air inside of 7 days.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. If as a matter of fact France and England permitted the emasculation of Czechoslovakia as a means of appeasement or to secure the continuation of peace with Germany, might they not be put in a position to concede the bases the gentleman has been describing in the Western Hemisphere as another means of appeasement?

Mr. PACE. They might; but, of course, I hope they will not.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not true that since the Munich conference it has been revealed pretty generally that Hitler was bluffing and they yielded to his bluff?

Mr. PACE. No; I think the fact has been developed that Mr. Chamberlain thought Hitler was bluffing until he made his first trip to Munich, and then he found out Hitler was not bluffing.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. The gentleman from Texas made the statement yesterday that the United States stands fifth in number of planes.

Mr. PACE. Yes; I have those figures.

Mr. ENGEL. He also stated that England had 7,000 planes and France had 4,000 planes. The gentleman gave these figures as an argument that we ought to increase the number of our planes. Now, however, the gentleman from Georgia states that France has 500 planes and England 1,500.

Mr. PACE. No; I said 500 modern planes; and let me tell the gentleman his own nation has only 500 modern army planes.

Mr. ENGEL. I am only reconciling the statement of the gentleman with the statement of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PACE. We have today approximately 1,700 Army planes in this Nation, but the testimony is that we have only 500 modern planes, planes that could stay in the air against an enemy. The same is true of France, and that is the reason France yesterday placed an additional order for 500 American planes in an attempt to obtain modern planes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In discussing the relationship of countries like Germany with the nations they possibly might conquer and thus acquire bases of operations, a real threat might come from the annexation of Mexico by Germany, which would afford entrance into the United States?

Mr. PACE. The Mexicans are good neighbors, and I hope they will have regard for our welfare. You can talk about no one being able to attack us, and say it cannot be done, but all an attacking fleet needs is a landing place, an overnight base. If they should be tempted, Mexico could give an enemy a temporary landing place. It may be said an attacking fleet could not come here and return, but it could come nearby, land, refuel, strike, and go; there is no question about that.

This little place known as the Panama Canal is the key to the defense of this Nation. Why? We must get our fleet across this strip of land. We cannot maintain a fleet large enough to defend both the Atlantic and the Pacific. We must keep this Canal open. Two or three well-placed bombs would destroy the Panama Canal as far as getting ships through it is concerned. The testimony before the committee is that the modern planes and the modern antiaircraft guns we have at the Canal would have exactly 20 seconds within which to

shoot down an enemy plane going from 300 to 350 miles an hour. Our forces would have 20 seconds to get that plane, and 20 seconds is not very long. Consider what would happen if a foreign country should as a result of peace terms following a war take possession of any of this territory that belongs to Britain and France, Bermuda, for instance, or any of these islands here. This is the one hundred and eightieth meridian, at which the Republican policy committee has recommended we stop our defense. You may say these British Islands are too far away, but we are committed to defend this entire area, North and South America, and the Canal is not too far from South America for bases to be established here.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. It strikes me the gentleman is proceeding rather rapidly and pointing out the very dangers into which we are going to be brought as the result of a war. Possibly the gentleman has more definite information than those on the committee have received as to the imminency of an attack by Germany and Italy on England and France. I heard nothing in the committee to that effect. I wonder if the gentleman would mind telling us what he believes Germany intends to do next.

Mr. PACE. I can give the gentleman no official opinion, of course, but only a summation of all that the gentleman and I have read and studied. I believe Germany today is ready to strike.

Mr. ANDREWS. Did the gentleman say "strike"? Where?

Mr. PACE. They could demand the Ukraine tomorrow.

Mr. ANDREWS. Would England object? Would anyone object?

Mr. PACE. You and I do not know. Italy can demand Tunisia tomorrow.

Let me point out, in speaking about planes, that I believe we ought to get all these planes right now. We are committed to defend Canada. I believe the whole American people applauded the President when he told the people of Canada that if they got in trouble we would come to their aid, and we should, because I believe if we got into a death struggle they would come to our aid. In addition, for selfish reasons we could not afford to let any enemy get into Canada. Do you know how many planes Canada has? Forty.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In speaking of Mexico, I hope it is not inappropriate to say that I might invite the attention of the committee to the fact that in the United States of America today there reside between 300,000 and 400,000 Mexicans who have not declared their intention of becoming citizens of this land.

Mr. PACE. They are a potential danger.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman does not mean to imply he would favor our going to war to join Great Britain, who had been joined by Canada in some European conflict. The gentleman confines that statement to an invasion for the acquisition of Canada.

Mr. PACE. I mean to convey the idea that if Canada is attacked it is to our purely selfish interest, in the matter of our own defense, to go to their assistance.

Mr. MAHON. If Canada is attacked in Canada.

Mr. PACE. That is correct. I prefaced my remarks by stating I did not favor going into a foreign war.

I want to make this statement. I do not think the President of the United States said, in fact, I know in my own mind he did not say that our frontier is on the Rhine. He may have said, and in my judgment he could have well said, that our first line of defense is England and France, and I repeat to you that whenever we see England and France go down we, as a nation, are in immediate danger.

Unfortunately, there is nobody in this world who loves us. We are either hated or we are the object of the envy of every

person outside of our own people. Hidden yonder in the valleys of Kentucky is practically two-thirds of all the gold in the world, and with our rich oil fields, mineral deposits, our fertile fields, we are the object of either envy or hate of everybody and it is my judgment, and my candid judgment, while we should never go over there with our boys, yet when England and France are in trouble, it'll become us to sit here and make objections when they come here with the cash money and put it on the barrel head to get something with which to defend themselves. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am a new Member in Congress, and I do not understand a lot of these things, but I should like to get this clear for myself and my constituents: Is this program one to defend America—

Mr. PACE. Solely.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Or is it a program to attack one particular nation—Germany?

Mr. PACE. This program, I may say, so far as my knowledge of it is concerned, is to try to modernize the American forces; to try to secure for the American forces what the War Department has been recommending for the last 15 years; that is, to give our boys in the National Guard and the standing Army, numbering 400,000, some modern guns, which they do not have now, and to give them a supply of ammunition to last for 30 days, to equip them with gas masks and uniforms and shoes, and to build sufficient anti-aircraft guns and airships to defend this Nation for the first 30 days, and that is all.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. PACE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman has made the statement that no nation loves us—

Mr. PACE. I do not think so.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Then, should not our policy be to prepare for defense against possible enemies from anywhere?

Mr. PACE. That is right, exactly. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. If my colleague has any information along this line, would he tell us what percentage of hits he thinks would be possible at the Panama Canal with airplanes traveling 350 miles an hour, where we have only 20 seconds within which to fire?

Mr. PACE. Of course, it would depend upon the number of planes. I think you would get about 1 hit out of 20 or 30, possibly. It would be a very small percentage.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes available I should like to make a few general observations on this question of national defense, raise a question on certain sections of the bill which are perhaps not clear to me, and mention one or two parts with which I disagree.

I have been pleased that thus far the debate has been absolutely nonpartisan and I hope that the day will never come when we will allow partisanship to affect our judgment on matters relating to national defense. [Applause.]

I am deeply interested in the question of national defense, and I express the wish that some Congress prior to 1917 had given like consideration to our aviation needs. [Applause.] If that had been done I might not today be speaking to you from a wheelchair.

It seems to me that our air industry in many ways has been stifled. I had the opportunity just last December to go through one of the larger factories manufacturing airplane motors, and I want to say that I have nothing but praise for the men who are operating our aircraft industry and for the employees in our aircraft factories. You can go to any factory or any industry in the United States and

you will not find a higher type of man than those who are turning out the aircraft that our Government and the world need.

It seems to me that the hand of our own Government has been rather heavy on this industry. The gross profits have been limited under one act; the Wage and Hour Act has placed certain restrictions on the industry that have prevented young and enthusiastic engineers from devoting desirable time to the study of the problems affecting the aircraft industry. All of this raises the question of where the money is going to come from for necessary research in this industry. One of three things will happen. The industry must be given the opportunity to earn money to spend in research, the Government can provide that money, or we are going to drop behind the other nations of the world in the matter of aircraft and air-motor production.

There has been a great deal of discussion, at least in the cloakrooms and through the press, about moving some of the national defense equipment factories to the interior. It is true that I live near the coast, and I am interested in the State of Connecticut, and in a district of that State in which are maintained two very important factories turning out material for our Army and Navy; but leaving that one thought aside, I cannot become much disturbed about the possibility of enemy aircraft bombing factories that are turning out supplies for our Government. I submit this question. If it were possible at the present time, and I am sure it is not, for an enemy bombing plane to come over here and plant its load, I raise this question: Would they pick out an aircraft factory, a munitions factory along the coast, or, for the effect it would have on the United States and the people of the United States, would they go on to the city of New York or even to the Capital here in Washington? I think that is something about which we need not be greatly concerned.

Another reason why I think it is very dangerous to consider moving these industries is that many of the men who have developed this industry have inherited their ability to work with fine tools. I do not believe that the money that is being appropriated or that will be appropriated for aircraft can in any sense of the word be considered wasted money. It seems to me it is practically the same as paying an insurance premium. We do not feel badly if we do not die within 6 months after we pay our first life-insurance premium, and I am willing to spend enough to give us the protection we need and hope to God that we never have to use it. An additional thought: One factory alone in the aircraft industry is today buying materials from and furnishing work for 68 different firms, employing 54,410 employees.

So much for general observation. I would like to mention now just a few of the sections of this bill, starting with section 13, which relates to the procurement of gages, jigs, and so forth. In this connection I pay my respects and compliments to my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. SMITH], who worked so hard for a period of years to bring this important matter to the attention of Congress, and I hope that when this bill is enacted he will feel that his efforts have been well repaid. [Applause.] It is a mighty important section of the bill. To go to the other end, section 8 of this act replaces section 8 of the 1936 act. The provision is not to exceed 5,500 serviceable airplanes and such number of airships and free and captive balloons as the Secretary of War may determine to be necessary. In my humble opinion, 5,500 serviceable airplanes, including training ships which do not become obsolete as fast as pursuit ships, is not an exorbitant request. I believe it is a very reasonable request. The question has been raised and very ably presented that we should perhaps limit this program to not more than 1,000 planes each year. I believe that will be offered as an amendment. When I first heard of that proposal I felt it was sound, and then I read the testimony of General Arnold offered before the Military Affairs Committee; I talked with people who were interested in the aircraft industry.

It seems that both they and the War Department feel they should be allowed to go ahead and build these 3,000 planes, if that is the number, and do it as fast as they can, in order to find out, if we can, where the bottle necks are in the aircraft industry, so that should there be an acute emergency we will know just how long it will take the industry to turn out a given number of planes in a given time. [Applause.]

Section 2 provides for the utilization of civilian flying schools, and provides that the Army may detail personnel to assist and to instruct the instructors of these civilian schools. I dislike to pit my limited knowledge against the judgment of some who testified before the committee, but I think it a very radical departure, and in some ways it seems, from my limited experience in the Air Service, a dangerous precedent. I see no value in training young men to fly commercial ships: I realize that the War Department will be asked and will make available military ships, and that there is nothing in the act to prevent these schools from giving their primary training on civilian ships. In that I see a great danger to the lives and necks of many students, because if these men get primary training on slow commercial ships and then try to do things with fast Army ships there will enter into it a large element of danger.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. COSTELLO. The purpose of allowing the civilian instructors from the civilian schools to go to Randolph Field is to obviate that thing. In other words, training instructors at Randolph Field will teach them the practices and methods of the Army in training the flying cadets. They will install those methods at the civilian schools. The Air Corps, under section 4, will loan Army aircraft, parts, and matériel to the civilian schools, so that they will use Army ships and Army equipment in their training. They will not use any civilian equipment at all.

Mr. MILLER. Can the gentleman assure us that they will not? I understand section 4 provides as the gentleman says, but is there anything in the act that will prevent them from giving their primary training, in order to speed this thing along, to allow them to get their primary flying in civilian commercial ships?

Mr. COSTELLO. No. If the student does not qualify, he is dismissed and does not go to Randolph Field at all. Unless they can qualify for the War Department specifications, as will be laid down by the Secretary of War, the graduates of those schools at the end of 3 months will not go to Randolph Field at all. The primary training will be wasted as far as they are concerned. In 3 months they will not learn enough about aviation to even be qualified for civilian flying.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Connecticut 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER. I raised the question on section 3 and I have had an answer to the question that was in my mind, that I could not find in any of the testimony, and I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] for his information.

Further, in section 3, I call attention to the fact, and I raised it in asking a question of one of my colleagues speaking yesterday afternoon, that the latter part of the section provides that no pension, compensation, and so forth, shall be paid in the event of personal injury. I submit that in this period of primary training, whether it is on War Department ships as we are told it will be, or on commercial planes, it is the most dangerous period of any pilot's training—when he makes his first solo hop. I cannot understand why that provision is written in to prevent them from receiving benefits in case of permanent injury, or their dependents in case of death.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. The gentleman is making a very fine statement on this act, but I would like to point out

that this section 3 applies to men who are instructors in the civilian schools, who are being brought to the Army training centers to standardize their methods of instruction. It does not apply to the students who are coming in as flying cadets and will go to the Army schools and become Air Corps officers. It applies to those civilian instructors only, to give them a brush-up course, to standardize their methods of training with the Army methods. They are paid by civilian schools. They are professional instructors, and for that reason, because they have no status in the Army, in section 3 they were not provided with any protection against injury. They have to provide that themselves. Their schools provide for their pay and any protection they get. That section, as I understand it, is limited only to those civilian instructors.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask further in that connection, section 3 provides for the enrollment of students in the Air Corps. When they go to Randolph Field, having completed their primary training, will they be entitled to the same protection as any air service cadet?

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. They are enrolled as students at the training school, but not in the Air Corps.

Mr. MILLER. And they will not be entitled to any of the benefits while taking training?

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Does the gentleman refer to these civilian instructors?

Mr. MILLER. No; I mean the students.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Oh, the students will be enlisted men under the same provisions as the flying cadets today; with the same protection that they receive today, as flying cadets. There is no change in that. The authorization is in existing law for the flying cadets.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the gentleman. My colleague has answered two or three questions on which I had notes, but I also want to refer to section 3, and I assume it is covered by the same provision the gentleman has outlined. It provides that the Medical Corps and hospitals will be made available in case of injury, but there are added the words "not including medicines or supplies." That provision rather puzzled me. If one of these fellows should crash, they would be put in a hospital, but they would have to send down to the corner drug store for a shot of antitetanus.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. I assume that would be paid for by the civilian school, because section 3 applies only to civilian instructors who are being given additional instruction.

Mr. MILLER. May I make this observation, that it seemed rather bad to set up anything that might cause delay at a time when no delay should be allowed. Whether these men are civilians or instructors or students, if they have a crash there should be nothing in the regulations that will prevent them from getting medicine and supplies if they are needed. I hope that at the proper time we can move to strike out those four words and clear up any possible misunderstanding in such cases.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. I have not thoroughly studied that language. It strikes me that the phrase "including medicines and supplies" is intended to be an exception for which the Government shall not be charged.

Mr. MILLER. It would appear so, but it does seem like very unkind treatment to a person who has crashed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut and wish to ask him a question. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I am wondering if the gentleman from Connecticut, in connection with his proposed amendment to section 1, realizes what the adoption of the amendment suggested would do? We still have in process this year on order over 2,000 planes. An additional 2,000 planes on top of orders from foreign governments would utilize practically the total productive capacity of the entire aviation industry of this country as outlined in the report of the retiring president of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. MILLER. I am aware of that; the gentleman is correct. This will require a total of almost 5,000 planes to be built in a year. I understood from the testimony of the Air Corps, however, that they wanted to find out what the industry could do. I provide the opportunity. I may say in this connection that I have seen the clause in the contracts relating to the manufacture of airplanes and motors for France, which provides that if any procurement officer of the United States sets up the claim that the foreign order or orders interfere with production for the United States, the needs of the United States must be given the right-of-way.

I think it is our duty to find out what the capacity of the aviation industry is, whether it is the 5,000 a year they claim. I want to give them a chance to show what they can do or if they can do what they say they can.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. RANDOLPH. You were one of those who flew in the World War—and I pay tribute to you. Is it not a fact that today we are recognizing that the Air Corps is going to be increasingly more important to us in the successful prosecution of any war in which we may engage?

Mr. MILLER. I believe so very definitely. I read a very interesting article by the French Air Minister in which he said that, regardless of the Army and the Navy, their future defense must come from the air. The same thing may apply to us. It depends on what they do for their air service. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, we have in the world two kinds of armies: One is the conscripted army—large in numbers, poorly paid, and rather poorly trained, the other is the small voluntarily enlisted army—we might call a professional army, highly trained—and comparatively well paid. We of the United States maintain the latter kind of army because it is in accord with our national policies. We as a nation object to a large standing army. We desire to menace no one, but we are determined to protect ourselves and our national interests wherever or whenever such protection may be necessary.

In our Army we have what is known as the initial protective force, that is a force composed of the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Reserves of the Regular Army. This protective force is believed to be sufficient in time of an emergency to protect this Nation until the final protective force has been formed. This initial protective force consists of approximately 400,000 men. The final protective force will consist of 600,000 additional men, which will make our forces at that time 1,000,000 men. Then, under the protection of this force, will be inducted, trained, and equipped the army necessary to take care of the situation at hand.

In order that we may preserve our national traditions in a military sense, and in order that we may protect American interests wherever they may be and whenever the necessity arises it is necessary that we be able to expand our system of national defense in the face of emergency to a point where it is capable of taking care of whatever demands that may be made upon it. For this reason and the others I have mentioned we prefer to have in our Regular Establishment and in our National Guard as high a class of men as possible, because in time of emergency when we go to expand our forces, we must use the organizations we have in existence as a skeleton on which to build the final protective force and the forces to follow. This is possible because of our system of voluntary service in time of peace.

Our needs in the matter of national defense are calculated upon the protection of the continental United States, our possessions in the Caribbean Sea, the Panama Canal Zone, Hawaii, Alaska, and the Aleutian Islands; and our initial protective force is composed of the components of our system of national defense in all of those areas.

The question has been raised here several times about the foreign policy of the United States in connection with this

program. I want to speak a little bit about this foreign policy and its relation to the present program. As everyone in the United States knows, regardless of the remarks of some of our professional isolationists who seek to capitalize upon their positions in order to make their presence upon the lecture platform more valuable, our position in regard to foreign affairs today is just the same as it has been ever since we have been a nation. Ever since we have been a nation our position in regard to our foreign policy has been that we are going to defend the United States of America and our direct possessions, and that we are going to protect American trade and American interests throughout the world. We have never had any other foreign policy, except, of course, the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine has been definitely defined and fixed, but in all other respects and under all other conditions our foreign policy has been flexible enough to meet whatever the demands in order to protect American trade and American interests. Regardless of what may be said, regardless of what may be inferred, our foreign policy today is the same as it has always been. I want to call to the memory of the Members of this Committee the fact that at one time we found it necessary to send a force to Africa to put down the Barbary pirates in order to protect American commerce. That was our foreign policy at that time.

I suspect there were ancestors of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] who at that time were engaged in the shipping business out of the New England States. I imagine those men welcomed the use of the American Navy under a flexible foreign policy when it was sent over there to suppress the depredations of the Barbary pirates, and maintain the prestige of a growing nation.

Later it was necessary in the interest of trade to send some American gunboats to Naples. Later on, if you will remember, the American Navy opened up the ports of Japan to American trade. Later on, under the administration of the Republican Party, we undertook a program of imperialism. We took the Philippine Islands, and we have them today. That was our foreign policy of that day. Later on, under the administration of a great Republican President, it was found to be expedient to interfere with a war between two great powers in the East—Japan and Russia. Later on, under the administration of a Democratic President, it was found to be expedient to engage in the World War. Never in all of our history has it been deemed wise to formulate our foreign policy in the public square or cry it from the house-tops. Why should we do so today?

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that we are a commercial nation, and we live by commerce. The commerce of this Nation is the commerce of the people of the Nation. It is not the commerce of the Grundys, the Mellons, or the Rockefeller. It is the commerce of all the people. It is not alone the commerce of Wall Street. It is just as much the commerce of Main Street and the streets across the railroad tracks. It is the commerce of the men who work in the mines and in the mills and on the farms. If you would shut us up within the boundaries of the United States of America and do away with that small percentage of goods that we export every year we would have an internal revolution. We cannot and must not become isolationists.

After all, when we adopt a policy of national defense, it is absolutely necessary that we adopt a policy which will be able to take care of the exigencies of whatever situation may arise in regard to our commerce and our rights as citizens of the world. Is there any man of responsibility in the United States of America today who would advocate in case of war that we abandon our traditional freedom of the seas? Is there any man, in case of war any place in the world, who would accept a mandate from any nation that would say, "Your ships must stay in your own ports"? You only have to go back in American history to the time preceding the War of 1812 and see what a disastrous effect an embargo on American commerce had within the Nation. As unpopular as the War of 1812 proved to be in certain sections of the United States, as that war went on and trade lanes were

opened up once more for American commerce, the war became popular in that section of the country.

Mr. Chairman, war is like any other contest. It is waged with an object in view. Wars are fought for the control of markets, for the control of trade lanes, or for the control of raw materials. Wars are but commercial contests appealed to the court of last resort in this world—the court of Mars. So, wherever trade lanes converge, wherever commercial interests conflict, whenever great supplies of raw materials lie undeveloped, there lie the seeds of warfare, and any nation which is to remain a prosperous and a mighty nation in this world must be prepared to protect its interests and maintain its national prestige.

This is a program which applies principally to the expansion of the Air Corps. It can by no means be called a program which might make for aggression or conquest, because there is no possible chance of conquest anywhere by an air corps. An air corps is not a self-sufficient unit. It cannot seize and hold territory. Although you might cross the sea with an air corps and create tremendous damage in the territory of an enemy, you could not seize and hold one foot of their territory by the use of airplanes. The only mission an air corps can be used for is to protect this Nation from invasion by a hostile air corps or to assist the mission of the land or water forces; and we are increasing those forces only very slightly.

Mr. Chairman, I want to leave with the membership of this Committee one thought. In the use of an air corps to repel an invasion, it would not be possible to keep that air corps within the continental limits of the United States in the hope of meeting an invading air force if one should come. An air force operates in three dimensions. There is a great deal of space in the air and before an air corps can afford sufficient protection to a nation it is necessary that it seek out the air force of the enemy, wherever it may be, and bomb or destroy the installations of the enemy's air corps before it can come to the shores of this Nation. To await the arrival of the enemy will be too late. Once on the way, the air corps of the enemy will discharge their load of bombs before turning back.

At the present time there is no possibility that any nation in the world could invade us from the air, unless they would acquire bases somewhere near this Nation, or unless they would use an airplane carrier to transport their planes at least a large proportion of the way across the ocean. No one knows, however, what range the planes of tomorrow may have or what air bases any foreign nation may procure. We must be prepared for any eventuality. The bomber is the capital ship of the Air Corps, just the same as the battleship is the capital ship of the Navy. The pursuit plane, the observation plane, the reconnaissance plane can do almost no damage. The bomber is the engine of destruction.

I am glad, therefore, that this program carries in it a large percentage of bombers, the ship of the air that can go out, meet, and destroy the airplane carriers of any foreign nation that intends to invade us, the ship of the air that can go to some base which an enemy nation may establish in this hemisphere, and destroy its airplanes before they can take off and reach this Nation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, the program is drawn with the idea of furnishing us, when it has been completed, with a well-balanced system of national defense, one that will leave us in a position to carry on a method of training that will build a sufficient program of national defense to take care of whatever needs we may have in wartime. There is almost no additional personnel connected with this legislation, except the additional personnel for the Air Corps and a little personnel to take care of the needs of the defense of the Panama Canal.

Anyone who will look over this program and consider the entire program will see that there is nothing in it that will enable this Nation to be an aggressor nation at any time.

None of the components of national defense included in this program will enable this Nation to go abroad or seize any territory of any nation whatever. This is a program designed purely and simply for national defense, a program incapable of being diverted to any other purpose, so far as our foreign policy is concerned and there is no possibility that this program can be used to promote any different kind of foreign policy than the one we have had throughout the entire history of our national existence. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN.]

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, there is very little that I can add to the very splendid discussion of the older members of the Committee on Military Affairs who have already presented their views so ably and clearly.

I wish to commend the witnesses who appeared before the committee for their very fair statements regarding the needs for adequate national defense. The War Department has been very, very sensible in what it is asking. It has kept its feet on the ground and held steady in the face of all alarms. It has asked just enough to bring our initial defensive forces, the Regular Army and the National Guard up to date in matériel.

The committee has done a good job, too, in holding strictly to the defense aim. There is only one hump in the program which I think should not be there—the immediate authorization for a total of 5,500 planes. For that reason, I joined in the minority report signed by 11 members of the committee, recommending that the authorization of 5,500 planes be limited to the extent that not more than 1,000 planes may be procured each year, in addition to those now on order or to be ordered under the current War Department appropriation bill for 1939-40.

In case of a declared emergency, the minority report provides that the full 5,500 planes be immediately authorized.

One object in recommending the 3-year period was to avoid overexpansion of plane factories, followed by a possible lull in which there would be no United States Government market for planes of the types needed for military purposes.

The plan recommended by the minority report would provide a more stable, long-range program for building up the airplane industry.

Another object is to prevent acquirement of a lot of planes built on frozen specifications, which would quickly become obsolete, and which obsolescence would prove very costly. In addition to giving our Army the advantage of further improvements that may be developed within the next 3 years while expanding to the total authorization of 5,500 planes, a major consideration for spreading the authorization over a 3-year period is, of course, economy. It has been estimated that the Committee on Military Affairs, in reducing the total authorization from 6,000 down to 5,500 planes, effected a saving of more than \$31,000,000; and when we consider that each 1,000 planes represents an expense of approximately \$56,000,000, it is easy to see why a Congressman representing an agricultural district with depression prices for agricultural products still prevailing is in sympathy with any reasonable and practical modification in the direction of economy.

With that background, I have carefully studied the evidence presented before the Committee on Military Affairs, and I have joined wholeheartedly with the minority group in recommending a proposal that should be a more helpful guide to the Appropriations Committee in shaping the appropriation bill than a blanket authorization in excess of apparent immediate needs.

All members of the committee have the same general objective—to provide an adequate and reasonable defensive protection for the Nation. That objective is sound and worthy of the support of Congress.

My distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] yesterday made the comment on the floor that every emergency that has been conjured up or pulled out of the hat by the present national administration during the past 6 years has evaporated into thin air. I would like to call

attention to one emergency that the present national administration has not dramatized in the headlines and one which will not evaporate quickly. That emergency monster lurking back of nearly every bill we consider is the forty-four and one-half billion-dollar debt. Let us let the Army fly, but let us level off at a safe and sensible altitude.

There is one provision contained in H. R. 3791 to which I wish to direct a few remarks, particularly with a view to bringing to your attention a few of the questions that have been passing through my own mind and for which I do not have the answers. I refer particularly to the last provision in section 5 starting on page 5, line 25, and continuing to the end of section 5.

This provision would extend retirement rights to officers and men of the National Guard, Reserve Corps, or any other armed forces of the United States who serve more than 30 days and incur disability in line of duty. By the terms of this bill, retirement is provided these men on the same footing as to pensions, compensation, retirement pay, and hospital benefits as officers and enlisted men of the corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Army. Knowing nothing of the background of this provision, which was hastily added in the concluding half hour of committee consideration without a word of testimony before the committee, I have a few questions to ask, which I hope will bring before the House a better background for consideration of this measure than I myself have at this time.

I am asking these questions not in opposition to the idea of retirement or other adequate protection to officers and men who are not members of the Regular Establishment. I am submitting these questions for your consideration in perfecting this measure to a more workable form if possible.

(1) Will this bill give retirement exclusively on the basis of disability to perform line duty in the armed forces, even though the disability may not interfere with ability to return to and engage in his civilian occupation?

(2) Does the bill give any consideration to the much less fortunate situation confronting the Regular Army officer who has been separated from any civilian occupation so long as to make it well-nigh impossible for him to take up a civilian occupation without extended training, and then only if he is in a position to afford and to undergo that training?

(3) Will the award of retirement for disability impose upon those retired under this bill any of the restrictions or liabilities governing retired officers and men of the Regular Establishment?

(4) Does the provision contemplate granting of retirement in the grade in which the officer or enlisted man is serving, regardless of total length of service?

(5) Does the length of service include any part of the period of service during which active duty of less than 30 days was performed?

(6) To whom is the administration of the bill delegated?

(7) Who are eligible to serve on the retirement boards?

(8) Will those retired under this bill be restricted concerning future occupation and pay such as that now imposed upon the retired personnel of the Regular Army?

(9) Will those retired be subject to call to active duty in emergency?

(10) Will they be subject to the Articles of War?

(11) Will they be tryable by courts martial?

(12) What constitutes the "armed forces" as that term is used in the bill?

(13) How many men are affected by the bill in the initial protective force, in a mobilization force, in a force of four and one-half million men if and when they may ever be called to duty?

(14) Has the War Department any estimate of the probable cost of this measure?

It seems to me that these questions are deserving of an answer, and it seems to me that Congress has the right to expect an answer to these questions from the members of the Committee on Military Affairs before being called upon to enact the measure into law.

Not knowing the answers to these questions, I can only close my remarks with an expression of hope that the members of

the Military Affairs Committee and other Members of Congress who may know the answers will volunteer to answer these questions fully and completely before Congress is asked to vote on the passage of this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, we are all for adequate defense for our country, but the question that is giving me concern is, Just what does this defense plan contemplate? Is it a part of a larger plan that may be all-embracing? It seems to me there is a lack of definite policy on the part of this administration, not alone in its dealings with foreign countries but as to the question of defense and also on domestic problems. Just how far are we going to go? How far east will our first line of defense extend, how far west, and how far south? That will make all the difference in the world. You can hold a short line with a regiment but if the line is extended far enough many divisions may be required.

I ask you, just whom are we arming against? It would seem that the time has come for the administration to take Congress into its confidence. I fear we are placing altogether too much emphasis on the dangers that lie without and at the same time ignoring most vital problems at home.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. If I do not have my history mixed up, I believe the gentleman is the only Member of the present Congress who voted against this country's entry into the World War when the matter was brought up on the floor of the House in April 1917.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is true.

Mr. BURDICK. At that time was there not a great deal of propaganda throughout the Nation that was very similar in character to what we hear now about war?

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me say to my good friend from North Dakota that we are now paralleling the history we enacted back in 1916 and 1917. If we follow that course we shall be drawn into another war just as sure as the rising of tomorrow's sun.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] told us at some length how the powers of the world envy and hate us. I believe that is true, and it leads to but one conclusion, that the "good neighbor" policy of this administration has bogged down. We have given vast sums of money to other countries. We have given them our home market. I ask you, in all sincerity, what else can we give them in order to get their good will? Would the President have us go over there again to make the world safe for democracy?

Mr. Chairman, the danger to the Republic lies within rather than without, with ten or twelve million men and women out of work, with over 3,000,000 families on relief, and with the small-business men facing bankruptcy. I received a letter this morning from one small-business man who stated that the taxes we have piled upon business are gradually squeezing out their lifeblood. Agricultural prices are at an all-time low when measured on a gold basis.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. BURDICK. Does the gentleman have in mind any information as to who disseminated the war-scare propaganda during the World War? Who was behind it?

Mr. KNUTSON. Most of it came from London and Paris, and we are getting another barrage from there now. The same old propaganda mills are grinding now that were grinding 22 years ago.

We sit here and waste our time setting up straw men to knock down. Do you realize that in the last 6 years one farm out of every five has been lost either through foreclosure or tax delinquency? Our national debt is at an all-time high, and the country is gripped with fear and uncertainty.

Let me call to your attention the mounting cost of government in this country. I hold in my hand an outline map of the Republic, the continental United States. The cost of government in this country consumes the equivalent of the entire income of every State west of the Mississippi River except Louisiana. Think of it! We are spending \$18,000,000,000 a year for government in this country. The cost of government takes all the oil of Oklahoma and Texas, all the gold of California, all the silver of Nevada, all the copper of Montana, all the wheat of Kansas and the Dakotas, all the corn of Iowa, all the manufacturing of St. Louis and Kansas City, all the aluminum bauxite of Arkansas, all the dairying of Minnesota, all the hard toil of the Nebraskans, all the coal of Colorado, all the potatoes of Idaho, all the ranches of Wyoming, all the apples of Washington, all the lumber of Oregon, all the sugar beets of Utah, all the mines of New Mexico, and all the desert produce of Arizona. Think of it! All those things we are spending on government. Where is the promise you new dealers made to us back in 1932 that you would reduce the cost of government 25 percent when you got in office? Instead you have increased the cost of operating the Federal Government from \$5,785,000,000 in the fiscal year 1933, when you took over the Government, to \$11,361,000,000 for the current fiscal year. In other words, you have doubled the cost of government instead of reducing it as you promised. Is that playing fair with our people? Where is your promise made back in 1932 that you would put the idle back to work, reopen the factories, and put this country back on a prosperous basis? Words, words, empty words—just promises that you had no idea of keeping, and when I say "you" I am talking of your leaders, promises your leaders had no idea of keeping. They were merely uttered to get votes.

I may tell you my friends, this country is honeycombed with festering sores of economic ills which, if not cured soon, will destroy the Republic. We sit here and fiddle with airplanes while ten or twelve million men and women are walking the streets looking for work and over 3,000,000 families are on relief. We are fiddling while Rome is burning. My God, have you lost your sense of perspective?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; briefly.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman know just exactly how much money we are going to spend under this bill? The bill is not clear in that respect, but I understand it is about \$375,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not believe anybody knows for sure.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman know whether it is \$375,000,000 or more?

Mr. KNUTSON. The \$375,000,000 is merely a start. Can the gentleman recall an appropriation this Congress ever made that was sufficient? This is but the beginning of a military program that may crush us in time.

Mr. STEFAN. Well, of course, Government business is the highest-priced business in the world.

Mr. KNUTSON. Especially under the New Deal.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman knows that in national defense it is also very important to have food. Did the gentleman recently hear that there will come out a statement today from the Department of Agriculture that the price of lard is going to go down to 5 cents a pound? Does the gentleman also know that we are annually importing into this country about a billion pounds of foreign fats and oils, and that the excuse for running the price of lard down is that we are raising too many hogs and too much corn? Does the gentleman believe in that sort of psychology?

Will not the gentleman agree that our food supply is our first line of defense and will be indispensable to us in the event of war?

Mr. KNUTSON. I agree with my friend from Nebraska 100 percent. It may be that we are raising too many political hogs. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of discussion has already ensued in reference to this very important bill. It is, therefore, not my purpose to go into the technical features of the bill, but rather to outline my own attitude in reference to the measure and what I believe to be the attitude of the other members of the committee with reference to this matter.

Over a month ago the Committee on Military Affairs took up the consideration of this national defense bill. We have heard witnesses from the Military Establishment of the United States. Our testimony has been confined almost exclusively to this type of witness. The committee has received the very best there is in the way of expert testimony throughout the country and I believe the committee and the Congress likewise are armed fully with all the facts necessary to decide this important question.

I may say, parenthetically, on behalf of the committee that as I sat there from day to day and watched the attitude of the men of the committee, both on one side and the other, I believe that each and every man on the committee was sincerely in earnest and honestly trying to work out the problem of national defense as the situation presents itself to us, and in presenting this bill to the House of Representatives, I believe it embodies a sincere effort on the part of the entire committee, except in reference to the proposed amendments, to present and solve our present difficulties.

My own attitude is that what we need is a good defensive bill. I believe the country as a whole wants whatever is necessary for absolute protection of this Nation, and I believe, as expensive as armament is, the country is willing to pay the necessary cost of protection against any foreign invasion as well as protecting our shores adequately.

Now, taking up two features of the bill, the first of which is the Canal Zone. As I sat in the committee I represented a prudent businessman of this country passing upon what was necessary and what was economical for us. Here was the Panama Canal located to the south and slightly to the west of the Capital of the Nation. On the one shore we have the Pacific and on the other the Atlantic. This Canal, as has aptly been said here today and yesterday, is the lifeline of the Republic. Through that narrow confine must pass the battle fleets of this Nation from the west to the east and back again. When peril approaches from the west, the fleet must be on those shores for protection. When it approaches from the east, it must be on the eastern shores for the same purpose. So this line, the Canal, must be kept open at all costs. It must not be closed even for a day or a fraction of a day if the Nation is to be adequately protected, and when the question under consideration was the appropriation for additional fortification of the Canal Zone it impressed me that this was a vital and an economical appropriation. The only way to get around keeping the Canal open is to increase the size of our Navy so that we may have an adequate naval force on both coasts at the same time. In the alternative, there is nothing to do but to maintain the Canal open, free to ingress at all times by our fleet and by our merchant marine. So from the viewpoint of national defense and from the viewpoint of a prudent businessman, representing a constituency that believes ardently in peace, that believes ardently in doing away with all absolutely unnecessary wars, representing, as I do, a constituency that believes in maintaining peace except to protect against invasion, I say that this item is fundamentally necessary.

We come now to the question of additional airplanes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has very properly, perhaps, indicated that the Panama Canal is our so-called life line. I have listened intently to all of the arguments that have been advanced here, and they have struck out generally at the peril that may come to democracies from three nations, Germany, Italy, and Japan. What would the gentleman suggest if the peril came from the west and from the east at the same time?

Mr. BROOKS. That is what has been termed in newspaper parlance a squeeze play, that is, to force the issue on

both sides at the same time. I am not a naval man, but the Navy is presented there with a problem of either dividing the fleet or placing it on one coast alone.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. MAY. The question that the gentleman from Wisconsin has just propounded to the gentleman from Louisiana is answered properly by saying that that is the very situation which makes necessary the program that we find in this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. PACE. And is it not also true that the policy probably would be under these circumstances—the reason the Panama Canal is so important—to concentrate the fleet in one ocean and try to annihilate the enemy and then go to the other ocean.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Is it not a fact that in Panama today there is not a single road across the Isthmus except the railroad and the Canal, that it takes 9 hours for a battleship to go through the Canal, and if we were attacked on one side we have no facilities for getting our armament or forces across the Isthmus simply because there is a little profit to be made in running a monopoly like the little Panama Railroad. Does the gentleman know these facts?

Mr. BROOKS. I am told that is correct. Approaching the question of additional airplanes, when this bill was first presented to the committee it embodied the idea of 6,000 airplanes. The committee heard the testimony of our experts and considered the testimony very carefully, and finally, after complete consideration of it all, we found that 5,500 airplanes were all that were necessary, and so revised the terms of the bill to make it a 5,500-aircraft proposition.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. In a moment. It is interesting to note that at the present time Congress has already authorized the building of 4,120 airplanes, so that the additional number of authorized aircraft under this bill will be 1,380 airplanes. Out of the additional 1,380 airplanes authorized, it is interesting to note that 1,335 could be termed combat planes.

It is interesting to note also that under the terms of this bill it is contemplated that we will have a reserve of airships of 2,163. This reserve is composed of some 800 to 850 training ships, to be used in training our pilots that go to the schools of the country, so that we may have a reserve of pilots. This reserve is also to be used in replacing damaged aircraft, used in ordinary drill and operations of the Army. The reserve is likewise to be used in keeping our ships in mechanical fitness so that when a ship needs to be repaired, immediately one from the reserve will be put into the line, so that our pilots may not be idle at any moment.

In conclusion, in reference to this bill, I want to say that I have studied it carefully, not from the standpoint of foreign policy but from the standpoint of home defense, and I think the members of the committee have studied it largely from this same viewpoint. Representing a defensive measure as this bill does, I think it is the minimum necessary to an adequate defense, and if we want to keep our country out of real, serious peril against foreign foes, the adoption of such a bill is fundamentally necessary.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman says that the present bill in its aeronautical provision provides justly and adequately for national defense. Is the gentleman's judgment on this question based upon the assumption of the airplane production at present available in Germany, Italy, and other countries against whom we are liable to have to defend ourselves?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Then if we provide 5,500 airplanes to be built within the next 6 months, a year, or 2 or 3 years, will not that relationship between this country and those nations constantly be changing so that it will require a constant

demand on the Congress for a constantly increased air force, and where is it going to end?

Mr. BROOKS. Let me answer the gentleman's question. He is in error in assuming that this bill provides for an additional 5,500 airplanes, as he stated. The error comes about in this way. We have already authorized 4,124 planes to be built. This bill merely authorizes an additional 1,380 airplanes to be built for the United States Army. Those airplanes are the additional ones, and the act does not authorize the complete building of 5,500 additional planes. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to make a short statement covering that provision of the bill which has to do with flying schools and the Civil Aviation Authority. I do not believe this has been mentioned during the debate. At any rate, little seems to be known concerning it.

I merely want to say that within this bill there is an item of \$7,000,000 for instructional and equipment payments to the civilian flying schools. This is the minimum fund which would permit the War Department to meet the accelerated rate of mechanics' training and primary training for pilots.

It may be of interest to Members of the House to know that a complete list of the educational institutions selected to participate in the first phase of the civil aeronautics program under the direction of the War Department has been made. It consists of 11 schools of the country. They are as follows:

Purdue University, University of Alabama, University of Minnesota, University of Washington, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Texas A. & M. College at Arlington, Tex., Georgia School of Technology, New York University, University of Michigan, University of North Carolina, University of Kansas, San Jose State College, and Pomona Junior College.

As I understand it, applications for training in this connection are to be made direct to Mr. Clinton Hester, Administrative Director of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THOMASON. The list of colleges which the gentleman has given the committee are those announced by the C. A. A., are they not, but they are not the accredited schools of the War Department, covering aviation schools?

Mr. ANDREWS. They are schools in which there are scientific departments at the present time set up and devoted to applied aviation aeronautical training.

Mr. THOMASON. But that list is the one announced by the C. A. A. and is not the list, as I understand it, that has already been accredited by the War Department for aviation training.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RUTHERFORD].

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to bore you and the members of the committee with a rehearsal of the provisions of this bill. The subject matter of the bill has been fully explained by our illustrious chairman the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] and the other members of the Military Committee who have preceded me in the discussion of the bill. As a member of the Military Committee, I simply want to publicly announce my approval of the bill, believing that it meets fully the needs of adequate national defense. The members of the committee were in general accord on all of the provisions of the bill, with the exception of section 1, which relates to the building of airplanes. I, as do the other members of the minority, believe that it would be better to spread the building of these planes over a period of years rather than to build them all in the period specified in the bill. The reasons for so doing were well set forth by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], a member of our committee. What constitutes adequate national defense is largely a matter of each Member's personal

opinion after he has given the subject what he considers sufficient study. A great many persons feel that their own personal opinion and judgment cannot be improved upon. I have never followed that course. Whenever I got into a subject out of my regular line of business, I always found it better to consult the best authorities I could find on the subject involved. So in regard to the subject matter of this bill, I am taking the advice and suggestions given by the Chief of Staff and his associates as to what constitutes the needs for adequate national defense. These gentlemen are professional soldiers. They have given years of study to all questions relating to war and the measures necessary for the adequate defense of this country. They are honest, upright, intelligent, and patriotic and have the interests of this country at heart.

They came before our committee and thoroughly explained the provisions of this bill and stated that in their opinion the provisions of this bill provided the minimum requirements for adequate national defense. They have given us their best judgment in the matter and we in turn pass it on to the full membership of the House, and it is now up to Congress to accept or refuse it. When a person is sick he goes to a doctor whom he thinks understands his case. The doctor after making a thorough and careful examination of the patient advises him as to what he thinks is necessary to be done to effect a cure. It is then up to the patient to decide if he can stand the expense of such cure. Congress is in that position today. The men who understand this question best and who have given it long and careful study say that the provisions of this bill provide simply the minimum requirements for an adequate national defense; and who are we to dispute their professional judgment? Our province as Members of Congress is simply to determine whether this country can stand the present expense and future maintenance. This program is going to cost real money to start and a lot of real money to maintain in the future. But be that as it may, if we are going to exist as a first-rate power we must put this program over. Self-preservation is the first law of nations as well as Nature. First things must come first and the providing for an adequate national defense is the first duty of Congress. That being the case we must of necessity provide the funds sufficient to put this program over, but we also have to remember that we have a national debt of over \$40,000,000,000 and that if we spend money for national defense we cannot continue to spend money on a lot of other things no matter how meritorious they may appear to be. Mr. Chairman, I have found out that when you are heavily in debt and the house needs a new roof and the old furnace needs to be replaced and the victuals still have to be provided for the family that you cannot continue to buy Packard cars and take ocean trips every year, if you expect to maintain your self-respect in the community. The same rule holds true for the Nation. If we buy national defense we cannot continue to throw away the taxpayers' money for things that are not actually needed. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LORD].

Mr. LORD. Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my mind but that we need to and should expand our air force, but there is some question as to how fast we should carry on that work.

I think it is a settled fact that a plane that is built today in 1 or 2 years is obsolete. If we build our planes all at this time, by the time they are completed we will have to discard them and start building new again. I believe we should go forward rather slowly, but with an adequate corps.

Now, we are to establish training fields near certain colleges, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] has just mentioned, that are proposed for these training schools. I regret the gentleman did not include one or two colleges in my own district in his statement. I want to call the attention of the House to Hartwick College at Oneonta, N. Y., and also New York Training School at Oneonta, N. Y., which is equal to a college. We have those two institutions located up there in the tablelands in the

central part of New York State. They are well located to establish training schools for pilots for airplanes.

We also have in this particular city of Oneonta a wonderful landing field with proper facilities to take care of planes that would care to land. We also have mechanics. This was a great railroad center until recently, and we have had trained mechanics there for many years. We have the mechanical forces there to do this work. So, if one of those training fields could be located at Oneonta, N. Y., it would be well located as a training-school base for those who want to take this course who are attending our colleges. We also have the mechanics to do the work, the facilities and fields for landing, and a good surrounding country to operate in.

It has been proposed that we use this new flying force for mail carriers. Throughout this section, where there is no force of mail carriers, we could well start out from Oneonta; and I call attention to the fact that the magnetos that are made for practically all Army, Navy, and commercial planes are made in Sidney, N. Y., in my district. They claim they are restricted too much under the 10-percent provision in profit. They can only make 10 percent profit, when oftentimes it costs them more than that in experiments and perfecting models so that our air forces can have the best planes in the world. We want to use these pilots for some useful purpose while they are training. We have the landing fields up at Binghamton, N. Y.; also at Norwich, N. Y. So that in this section we could well start from Oneonta with our flying forces and put them to carrying our mails, where we do not have the air service, and at the same time train them for the work they may be needed for, but for which we hope they will never have to be used.

I have a resolution from the Chamber of Commerce of Oneonta calling attention to all these facts. There is a small portion of that which I would like to include in my remarks. It will not take more than 10 or 12 lines in the Record.

Resolution

I, W. A. HOLLEY, Clerk of the city of Oneonta, N. Y., do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct transcript of a resolution duly adopted by the common council of said city on January 24, 1939:

"Because of the probability that a plan to train reserve forces of airplane pilots and mechanics will be instituted by the Federal Government in the near future, and the suggestion in conjunction therewith, that air-mail feeder lines be established, with airports at strategic centers, it seems fitting that the several advantages of the city of Oneonta as such a center, namely, its geographical location; its existing airport; its adaptiveness toward the training of pilots, through the availability of students attending Hartwick College and the State normal school; the very timely opportunity to obtain skilled mechanics, made available by the curtailing of employment in the local railroad shops, who can easily and quickly adapt themselves to the proper training, should be brought to the attention of the proper authorities: Be it

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, Senator JAMES MEAD, Congressman BERT LORD, and the Civic Aeronautics Authority to respectfully request that these advantages peculiar to Oneonta be pointed out and considered if such a plan is authorized."

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the city of Oneonta, N. Y., this 3d day of February 1939.

[SEAL]

W. A. HOLLEY, City Clerk.

Mr. Chairman, if we could establish this field, as I hope we may—and I hope this Committee will take notice of the facts I present and include this college town as one of the towns where this training shall be had—I believe it would be a great advantage to all of central New York, to all of our Nation in fact, for from this flying field they could reach out to New York City and all our Atlantic coast line should the time ever come when we move to defend ourselves. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELOSON.]

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the positions taken here today, and I appreciate the viewpoints of our constituents. There are other questions we ought to take into consideration in connection with national defense. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that there is considerable tension throughout the world today.

As far as I personally am concerned, I am in favor of appropriating this money for the program of air defense, and my reason for it is this: In Japan today we see a spirit of aggression similar to that which existed some 400 years ago in China during the days of Genghis Khan and Kublai Khan. The Japanese are trying to get additional territory, and they need it. Excessive population in their own country and their desire to be a great world power are uppermost in their minds. The same situation exists in Germany.

We must bear in mind also in this connection the fact that the Japanese Army has been trained under the German Army for over 40 years and there is an intimate union between Japan and Germany.

Our problem today is not concerned so much with what we want to do as with what we may be compelled to do. There is no question in my mind but that war will break out in Europe, and I think that this year will decide it. The question of appropriation for our air force, the number of planes we should build, makes very little difference; because if war breaks out, no matter what provision we make in this bill, we shall have to protect ourselves. This attitude will be necessary not because we are going to be invaded but because we may have to defend ourselves by preventing an enemy establishing bases close to our shores. In the event of an attack on Great Britain—and it might happen—and if Great Britain should lose, the enemy naturally would try to establish bases on this side of the Atlantic. Suppose they tried to establish such bases in the Caribbean Sea, the West Indies, or Canada, whether we want to go to war or not, we would be forced to step in to defend those places in order to defend our Nation. These are factors we must bear in mind today as we discuss this defense program.

I think it is entirely reasonable to limit the amount of production as advised in the minority report. After all, that does not matter. It is not entirely within the sphere of Congress to handle the situation. If Great Britain is attacked, and, as I said, should fail to hold back the enemy, then we would have to speed up our own production. Another thing to bear in mind is that if Great Britain should be attacked, the airplanes that we are now sending to England and France might possibly be used against us; that is, if England should be unable to protect herself. We might have to meet attack from our own production of airplanes and also from other war machinery. These are things, of course, that must be taken into consideration at the present time. So I say the problem is much more far-reaching than it may appear to be as discussed here today.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. THORKELSON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman said that there is a possibility that the planes we are sending to England might be used against us.

Mr. THORKELSON. I said so; yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Would the gentleman enlighten that for us a little? Would he tell us how that might come about?

Mr. THORKELSON. Suppose Germany attacked England; it is quite possible. The attack would not be by an army, but would be by an air force and their effort would be to destroy shipping to keep food supplies from reaching England. In the event of the success of such an undertaking, England might be forced to sue for peace, and with her armaments taken over, in such event, they would, of course, be used against us; that is, if Germany or the other powers intended to use them for that purpose. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I abhor the thought of having to vote for large armaments, but in the present psychology of the world it seems to me to be the part of wisdom and patriotism to do whatever may be necessary to protect America. [Applause.]

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I would like to yield, but in 3 minutes I cannot; I am sorry.

Mr. Chairman, in the limited time vouchsafed to me I shall present for the consideration of the Committee an amendment to this bill I would like to see adopted; so if you kindly will, you may be giving it your thought before the bill is taken up under the 5-minute rule. It is an amendment which I know would be heartening to the friends of peace not only throughout the United States, but throughout the world.

I see no real reason why there should be any objection to it from any quarter, and I hope when I shall have explained it the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] will agree to accept the amendment.

If you will turn to the last page of the bill, you will see that the final section is No. 13. I should like to see added to the bill another section, No. 14, reading as follows:

SEC. 14. The United States would welcome and support an international conference for limitation of armaments and in the event of an agreement of the world powers, to which the United States is a signatory, providing for such a reduction of armament, the President is hereby authorized and empowered to suspend so much of the program provided in this act as it may be necessary to eliminate in order to conform to said agreement.

I may say this is almost the same provision as adopted in connection with the naval expansion bill last year. It was agreed to by everybody then, and I hope the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs will accept the amendment.

If this amendment is adopted, it will be the only glimpse of peace associated with this embattled bill. It would at least give the peace-loving people of the United States the satisfaction of knowing that the Congress, which is the branch of Government nearest to the people, has gone on record this year, as it did last year, on the proposition that the United States "would welcome and support an international conference" looking toward a mutual agreement that will check the mad race of armaments.

What are we going to say if we refuse to adopt this amendment this year, in view of the fact that we went on record in favor of a similar proposal last year? Are we going to leave the inference that Congress is of a different opinion this year, that we have grown more militaristic, that we are no longer in favor of an international conference to limit armaments? I deny that Congress has changed its view, and I know that the people of America have not changed their views. The people want us to keep out of the whole foreign mess. And while they will sustain an adequate program of defense, they would be mightily pleased if our Government would take the lead in a movement for an international conference, when representatives of the powers would get together like human beings around a table and decide to stop the foolish rivalry that is leading all of the nations to bankruptcy and the brink of war.

We have a very impressive precedent for the amendment I propose to offer. On March 18 last, Representative CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, arose and offered a committee amendment to the naval expansion bill, which was adopted in substance as he offered it. That amendment became law, and is section 9 of the Naval Expansion Act, signed May 7, last year. Let me read to you the text of section 9, so you may see how similar to it my amendment is:

SEC. 9. The United States would welcome and support an international conference for naval limitations and in the event of an international treaty for the further limitations of naval armament to which the United States is signatory, the President is hereby authorized and empowered to suspend so much of its naval construction as has been authorized as may be necessary to bring the naval armament of the United States within the limitations so agreed upon, except that such suspension shall not apply to vessels and aircraft then actually under construction.

If my amendment is not adopted, we will be in the anomalous position of heralding to the world that Congress was in favor last year of a world conference for naval limitations but is silent this year in respect to a world conference on military limitations. We owe it to the millions of sincere people who believe in peace not to deny them the cheer and encouragement which my amendment would afford. To

them the future seems black enough, goodness knows. Let us not make it seem blacker by adverse action or inaction on this amendment.

I do not have any right to quote the Secretary of State, but I will say that it is my firm conviction that he would have no objection to this amendment. And I want to quote what the President said at a recent press conference when he enunciated his four-point program of foreign policy. One of the points in that program was as follows:

We are in complete sympathy with any and every effort made to reduce or limit armaments.

My amendment harmonizes absolutely with the views so often expressed by the President and the Secretary of State. I know that it expresses the inarticulate hopes and aspirations of millions upon millions of our people who fear that the world is on the road to war and that we are traveling with it. From the standpoint of the reassurance which our people so much need, it would be a great mistake, I think, to fail to adopt the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the May bill (H. R. 3791). No man more deplores than I do the necessity of appropriating large sums for instruments of death and destruction at a time when our people's peacetime needs for housing, medical care, old-age assistance, social and unemployment security, and farm aid remain in large part unprovided for. But the world conditions which force us to spend for defense are not of our making. We may hate war, but we cannot deny that war threatens every nation today, including our own.

In the face of this clear and present danger we must, however reluctantly, provide adequate means of self-defense. In his opening message to this Congress, the President emphasized the interrelationship of the three arms of defense—rearmament, foreign policy, and national unity. I call your attention to the fact that those who, in the course of this debate, pose the question of choosing between expenditures for defense and for the social welfare of our people are ironically enough the same gentlemen who voted against the \$875,000,000 relief appropriation. They are the same gentlemen who in the last session fought against wage and hour legislation and block or try to whittle away every appropriation to provide adequately for the people's needs. They are the enemies of the Wagner Act, of antilynching bills, of a national health program, of the T. V. A. Thus they seek to weaken our defense by disrupting our national unity and denying to our people the domestic security which will make them strong and give them a working democracy worthy of their loyalty and devotion.

SOME SPEECHES SOUND LIKE HITLER

These same gentlemen oppose also the foreign policy of President Roosevelt, and seek to weaken us in the second arm of defense. They tell us that the war mongers of Rome, Berlin, and Tokyo mean us no harm. They tell us that it is that man in the White House who has conjured up the bogey of war and who will lead us into war. They do not seem to be abashed by the fact that it has become almost impossible to distinguish their speeches from the speeches of Adolph Hitler and the inspired press comments of Mussolini's poison-pen writer, Gayda. In Rome, in Berlin, in Tokyo, our great, peace-loving President is painted as the world's No. 1 war-monger. We have become used to the cynicism of those dictators whose planes and bombs murder the women and children of China, Spain, and Ethiopia. But as a people we are profoundly shocked to hear the cant of the war-making dictators echo in the Congress of the United States.

It has been charged by Members of this House that the President wants us to "police the world," and that that is why he is asking for more airplanes and battleships. But look at the past record of these present advocates of isolationism. Did the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish] object to our policing Nicaragua in the interests of dollar

diplomacy? Would he object today to our policing Mexico in the interests of the Oil Trust?

THEY TELL US TO MIND OUR OWN BUSINESS

I am afraid that those who are so eloquent in telling us to mind our own business, in fact want us to neglect our business and mind the business of a few big industrialists and bankers instead.

OUR BUSINESS IS PEACE

Our business, the business of the American people, is peace. I would like to repeat to this House a challenge thrown down by a Republican, a very conservative Republican, and an anti-New Deal Republican. I quote from an editorial in the United States News of February 6 by David Lawrence:

Will the Republican Party take the position that it has no interest in keeping the British fleet from being destroyed by a Nazi air force? If it does so for purely political reasons, it will lose the support of the many fine Republicans in the rank and file who do not wish these United States to be made unsafe for democracy.

Will the Democrats who have been sniping at the President's foreign policy openly avow that they prefer a triumph of Nazi Germany in the world to an assertion of our sympathies with the democracies of the world?

For if either of these groups do feel that way, then the 1940 campaign will have a real issue—and it will not be war or peace. It will be an issue between those who would not lift a finger to keep the Fascist system from being imposed upon us and those who would make almost any sacrifice, including human life, to protect the democracy of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that this bill will pass, and by an overwhelming majority. The gentlemen on the other side of the aisle will not dare to oppose this measure. But they have already made it clear that they will snipe at it, try to slow down the process of building an adequate air force, and above all use this debate for an attack on the President's foreign policy.

I ask them, and the Tweedledums on my own side of the aisle, to look around them, to read the newspapers, and face the facts. If they have any vestige of real patriotism, they cannot long continue to repeat the nonsense that "we have nothing to worry about, nobody will attack us, only the President will lead us into war, only the White House is the seat of the war danger."

CALIFORNIA IS WORRIED

I come from the great State of California, and I tell you that my people out there are worried, and it is not the White House that they are worried about. They can see, even if some Senators and Congressmen cannot, how every retreat before the aggressors, in any part of the world, has repercussions in other parts of the world and on our own hemisphere. It is a long way from California to Barcelona. But the fall of Barcelona and the loss of Catalonia to the Fascist forces in Spain had immediate consequences in the Far East, and so brought the war danger nearer to our western seaboard. Japan seized the island of Hainan. This act was of relatively little significance to the war in China, for China no longer depends on that route for supplies. But the seizure of Hainan strikes directly at the vital interests of France and Great Britain, and at the vital interests of the United States as well.

WE SHOULD HELP DEMOCRACIES

We could have prevented the seizure of Hainan and so strengthened our own defense. We could have done so without building one extra battleship, or firing one shot, or shedding one drop of American blood. We could have checked Japan by lifting the embargo against Republican Spain, and so changing the whole world situation by showing our intent to aid the victims of aggression, by placing our vast moral and economic power on the side of democracy and peace.

We could have stopped Japan in the Far East if we had not so tragically tried to "legislate neutrality"—with the result that we have strengthened and built up the aggressor nations. We could have stopped Japan by placing an embargo on arms, scrap iron, and all the raw materials of war, and by cutting off all imports from Japan which now provide her with needed foreign exchange.

The fall of Catalonia and the seizure of Hainan have had other consequences which strike perilously close to the safety of California and to the peace of the United States. Every victory for fascism in Europe and Asia emboldens the Fascists of Mexico and Latin America. I am told on good authority that in the past month the Fascist victories in Spain and the Far East have given rise to a new wave of Fascist activity in Mexico and other nearby Latin American countries. In Mexico the Fascists who are preparing to play the part of Sudetens have been openly demonstrating, celebrating the victories abroad and preparing for similar victories on this continent.

In the face of these very real dangers I cannot join with the advocates of disarmament, military, economic, social, or diplomatic.

On the contrary, I support the bill now being considered by this House. I support it because I am confident that our armaments will be used to defend our national security, our democracy, and peace.

At the same time I urge that we speed particularly our diplomatic defenses, and make our foreign policy a policy of clearcut resistance to fascism and Fascist aggression.

Imperative as is the need to pass this measure, even more imperative is it that we hasten the amendment of the present Neutrality Act, to make it a real instrument of peace. I have just read in this morning's New York Times that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has introduced a bill to amend the existing Neutrality Act. I have not yet had an opportunity to study his bill. But from what I know of the Senator from Utah, and from what I can judge of his bill as set forth in the newspaper account, I believe it is a step in the right direction. This bill would apparently permit the President and Congress to determine the aggressor, and defines the aggressor as one who violates a treaty to which the United States is signatory. It then provides for withholding aid to the aggressor nation and for furnishing aid to the victim of aggression. That is my present understanding of the bill, and that is, in my opinion, the principle on which our foreign policy should be founded.

I hope that the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House will soon receive and consider a companion bill to the one introduced by the Senator from Utah, perhaps with suitable amendments. I hope that we will move with all possible speed to strengthen our defenses, not only in the air and on the sea but through the adoption of a policy of aid to our sister democracies and resistance to aggressors, as well as through the expansion of the New Deal's domestic program, which unites our people in the struggle for security and opportunity.

Above all, I hope that the majority of this House will make the vote on the May bill a real demonstration of national unity and patriotism—a vote of confidence in the President and in his policies for peace. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think one of the most difficult things for any Member of the House to do is the right thing when a bill of this character, highly technical in its nature, relating to national defense, comes before the House. It is almost impossible to know where the line should be drawn when it comes to national defense. Certainly no patriotic American would want to be guilty of not having adequate defense; on the other hand, no man wishes to be a party in stirring up a feeling which might involve war, such as was done some years ago.

In order to appreciate just what bombing means to the various communities in the war zone, may I recall a vivid experience which I had? I was in London during the air raids of December 1917. I was a tenderfoot. I recall hearing the young Boy Scouts on the streets call "Take cover!" The city was in total darkness. A telephone call came to the room for everybody to come below, and, of course, we all went.

A hostile plane was flying over the city. There may have been several. At least one of them was finally trapped by

the English planes and brought down. But in the meantime vast quantities of high explosives were dropped. You could hear the explosions. You could feel the vibration in the buildings.

The next morning we went out with an official to see the devastation brought about. The bomb had dropped into a section occupied by the poor people of the city of London. Houses were utterly demolished. Hundreds of brick buildings were blown up. One bomb had gone through a schoolhouse, but fortunately no students were in it at the time. This bomb was imbedded in the floor of that schoolhouse.

Little children were standing around, innocent victims of the tragedy, with their hands mangled. People were standing around with bandages over their heads. They were homeless.

I remember one laundry was destroyed. I was not in Congress then, and neither was the man with me. An Englishman with a monocle had been showing us around. Of course those people felt and knew what war meant. My colleague said to the Englishman: "Do you know that the laundry was blown up last night, and my laundry was in it?" The Englishman adjusted his monocle and said, looking at him in supercilious disgust, "My word, what a tragedy."

We were tenderfeet. We did not realize what was happening. I remember also being in the city of Lyons one night when the call came to take to cover. There was a dugout provided. Men, women, children, army officers—all classes—who could get under cover were there. A few nights before the railroad station had been blasted to pieces. They had to conceal every light in the city. A lighted cigarette was not even permitted on the street. In those days planes were slow, but now a plane can go over from Berlin to London in 79 minutes. I can therefore understand why those people over there are greatly alarmed.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing we ought to consider. There is no use becoming hysterical when it comes to a program of this kind. I believe the proposal of the gentlemen from New York [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. WADSWORTH], to stagger the manufacture of these planes is a very sensible and a wise thing to do. If I am not misinformed, it would be absolutely impossible to get the raw materials necessary to go into the manufacture of these planes unless we are going to build inferior planes. Aluminum today is allotted to industry on the basis of a quota. There is a shortage. This means we ought to go along in a sensible, sane sort of way and stagger the manufacture of these planes. This will give ample time to turn out the men to man these planes. Not only that, but the art is being developed with great rapidity. I have flown a great deal, as some of you have, and I know you recognize the fact that during a period of even 2 or 3 months when you get aboard a plane you see marvelous improvements in the plane. What is the use of going ahead and building planes we cannot man and then have them absolutely obsolete by the time we are going to use them? I hope therefore that we can use a little common sense here today and not be hysterical at all and stagger the manufacture of these planes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill; but I am also going to consider an amendment which I understand will be proposed.

In our consideration of the half-billion-dollar national defense bill, including among other items expenditures of \$23,750,000 for defense of the Panama Canal Zone, we must guard against steps which would lead us into another abortive attempt to end wars.

I am fully convinced of the necessity of providing ourselves with adequate national defense, but only to the extent of protecting ourselves and in support of the principles incorporated in the Monroe doctrine.

We as a Nation must not risk our national security by meddling in the domestic affairs of foreign nations. Other nations have the same right to choose their forms of government as we have to choose our form of government. I firmly believe that appointive officials of our Government would be following a much wiser course if they refrained from provocative utterances concerning the domestic or internal affairs of foreign nations.

The United States cannot afford again to send the flower of its youth to right internal wrongs in countries on the other side of our oceans. Surely we have domestic problems of sufficient import to demand the entire attention of our young men as well as our elderly men.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted daily with predictions that a war between the most powerful nations in the world, including this Nation, is not too far distant. Coming events always cast their shadows. Where is there a shadow today that is being cast in this country to the effect that we may be attacked by any nation across the Atlantic Ocean? But we should remind those nations that they have not as yet settled debts incurred during the World War, which was ironically called the war to end wars.

We have paid our debt to France. France owes us \$4,000,000,000 as a result of debts contracted during the World War. France has paid on her indebtedness \$486,000,000.

England borrowed over \$4,000,000,000 from the United States to finance her part in the World War, and of this amount \$2,000,000,000 has been paid; but today England owes us more than \$5,000,000,000 in war debts, including interest on the principal, according to figures released by the War Department.

We have not forgotten, nor will we forget in our generation or in generations to come, that 119,956 men, of the finest strata of our Nation, gave their lives in the World War. We will not forget the 37,568 men who died in action. We will not forget the 12,942 men who died as the result of wounds received in action. And we will not forget the 69,442 men who died as the result of injuries, diseases, and other ailments incident to the World War. Neither will we forget the fact that in many of our hospitals throughout the United States there are soldiers still suffering from diseases and injuries they contracted or received during the World War.

Mr. Chairman, it is not the duty of the United States to police the world. As representatives of the people of our Nation we must prevent the United States from becoming a policeman of the world. That is not our business. I am for this bill only for the purpose of protecting this country and the countries of the Western Hemisphere against attack by foreign nations. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I was much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. I believe those remarks, supported by the chart of the world showing the possessions of the United States, Great Britain, and France were most fundamental and timely, expressing as they did, in my judgment, after a detailed, extensive, and intensive study of our problem of war and peace over a period of 20 years, one of two possible eventualities which may overtake our country during the next 3 years, and against which we must prepare.

After our very unsatisfactory and destructive experience of unpreparedness in 1917 and 1918, with which we are all painfully familiar, I am very much interested in the right sort of preparedness, preparedness to safeguard democracy and preparedness to safeguard the lives and property of our citizens.

I always feel, with most other people, that all these expenditures for war purposes are bad and should be voted down and the money expended in more constructive ways if we could only do it. But then again, when we consider the state of the world, with its military dictatorships and aggression transgressing all the laws of God and man every day, then we know that we must do something along the line suggested in the bill which is before us for consideration. We all certainly want to do the right thing in this respect,

so the question becomes, it seems to me, what is the right thing in terms of democracy and in terms of the precious lives of the sons and daughters of America?

If we could take a vote here today on the question of whether a majority of us feel there will or will not be a war forced upon us in the near future, whatever its cause and whatever its justification, I believe from the remarks which have been made that the majority feel that such a thing will come. Then is not the plain duty of all of us to take immediately every step to prepare and protect ourselves and our priceless heritages and our sons and daughters against that day which we see on the horizon? I believe so, and I must cast my vote accordingly. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved June 24, 1936 (49 Stat. 1907), is hereby repealed. Section 8 of the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 780), is hereby stricken out and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 8. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to equip and maintain the Air Corps with not to exceed 5,500 serviceable airplanes, and such number of airships and free and captive balloons as he may determine to be necessary for training purposes, together with spare parts, equipment, supplies, hangars, and installation necessary for the operation and maintenance thereof. In order to maintain the number specified above, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to replace obsolete or unserviceable aircraft from time to time: *Provided*, That the total number of airplanes and airships herein authorized shall be exclusive of those awaiting salvage or undergoing experiment or service tests, those authorized by the Secretary of War to be placed in museums, and those classified by the Secretary of War as obsolete. *And provided further*, That the total number of airplanes authorized in this section shall include the number necessary for the training and equipment of the National Guard and the training of the Organized Reserves as may be determined by the Secretary of War."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS: On page 2, line 3, after the word "thereof", strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That other than airplanes now on order, or to be on order, under the provisions of the Military Establishment Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1939-40, or those which from time to time may be rendered obsolete, not more than 1,000 airplanes may be contracted for during any one fiscal year, except in the event of the declaration of a national emergency."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I think the provisions of the suggested amendment are fairly well understood in a general way, but in listening to the various speeches that have been made and in reading current statements in the press, it is obvious that the full intent of the amendment is not understood.

May I bring you back for a moment to the exact figures covering this situation? We have on hand today within the Air Corps, 1,797 planes. There are of that number to be rendered obsolete this year 351 planes, leaving us 1,446 planes as the net balance. I also want to remind you we have at the present time, or did have on December 31, 1938, 558 planes on order, and it is already proposed and approved by the Budget that in the coming Military Establishment bill for the fiscal year 1939-40 we will order 446 more. In other words, the Air Corps has now coming in or shortly to be under contract, over 1,000 planes.

The amendment which I have just offered has nothing to do with those 1,000 planes or even beyond those 1,000 planes that during the next year or two may be rendered obsolete. We merely say that beyond the 1,000 planes that the Air Corps now knows it is going to get this year, not more than 1,000 of the remaining 3,000 under this authorization may be ordered in one year. In other words, the War Department with, roughly, 1,000 planes coming in now, may in addition, even with the adoption of this amendment, order an additional 1,000 planes this year which would leave the Department in the position of having on contract for early acquisition over 2,000 planes in this year's business.

I want this to get home to you. All we ask is to stagger the remaining 3,000 planes so that not more than 2,000 planes may be contracted for or in process this year and next year you shall order 1,000 planes and the year following you shall order 1,000 planes.

Let me say a word or two about the situation as I believe it appeals to the officers of the Air Corps themselves and to the industry. I believe if we went to the head of any large aviation industry, and I have two fairly large ones in the district which I happen to represent, or even to the officers of the Air Corps, and if we would say to them, "Here is this amendment and we will guarantee that this amendment will be reflected in appropriations," they would say, "Certainly, that is the way to go at it."

Mind you, if this amendment is not adopted, it is the plan and the purpose and the policy to order all of the planes now under frozen specifications. So I only offer this amendment with the thought it will carry out, if translated into appropriations, what any reasonable, sound businessman knows would be for the good of his industry, for the good of his labor, for steady employment, and for a resulting balanced load over a period of 3 years instead of finding ourselves at the end of that time at the end of a big hump and out of soap, so to speak.

It seems to me this is the logical thing to do, and I offer the amendment in the thought that if it is adopted, then those on the Military Committee next year should see to it that the Air Corps at that time gets its 1,000 planes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The matter of production can be controlled entirely by the Appropriations Committee, can it not?

Mr. ANDREWS. It can; but, nevertheless, we will be laying down a principle and a policy for them to follow if we adopt this amendment.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Is it not a fact that the amendment the gentleman proposes destroys the recommendation and runs counter to the recommendation of the Chief of Staff and the Chief of the Air Corps of the United States Army?

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not believe so, if we could get a frank statement from them.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. So far as the record is concerned, that is true, is it not?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can reach an agreement with the gentlemen on the minority as to time for discussing the pending amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the gentleman not become too hysterical in trying to push through this bill. This is one amendment which will require a little time and I would suggest that debate run along for a while.

Mr. MAY. I wonder if 30 minutes would be satisfactory.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not see any reason for any limitation on the time. This is one amendment where we will have some real debate and I think it is a matter that should have some real consideration.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the trend of the entire argument on this bill has been to the effect that we should follow the recommendations of the Chief of Staff, the Secretary of War, and their aids in respect of this entire program. I simply want to call attention to the fact now that the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], than whom there is no finer gentleman in the House, and to whom I accord credit for aiding very materially in this legislation, would completely set at naught his own argument. In other words, the gentleman has argued from the beginning of the hearings and from the beginning of the debate and still argues and still believes that we ought to keep the industrial plants that are adapted to the production of airplanes at work regularly all the while. Now he proposes in his amendment here to say that we will not let them build more than about 2,000 planes the current year, when the evidence before the committee disclosed clearly that the country has at present a capacity of 2,500 planes per year. At cross pur-

poses with his entire contention, shall we refuse to listen to the voice of wisdom in the face of approaching trouble? Shall we tie the hands of the men we shall have to follow in case of war? Shall we again send our soldiers to the battlefield with their hands tied and their lives to be sacrificed?

The figure he gives would reasonably cover the first year's production, but let us see what it would do to the next 3 years that he proposes to inject into the plan by this amendment. We would have developed the capacity of the plants to probably 3,000 a year, or 4,000 a year, or 1,200 a month at the end of the first year, and then he proposes to cut off orders and say you can have only 1,000 planes a year, and this proposes one-third of capacity for the next 3 years. So that his argument falls of its own weight. Furthermore, it has been proven in the hearings before the committee, and there is no serious question of the fact that by the allowance to the War Department under the supervision of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff and the Procurement Division, all of whom are very capable gentlemen, of the privilege of contracting for planes in mass production or in large numbers, that they can save multiplied millions of dollars in the purchase price of the material to be acquired under this program. Then, if gentlemen on the other side of the House are so much interested in economy as they say they are, and I am sure they are, why not give leeway to the War Department and let them contract for planes at, say, \$50,000 each, instead of \$100,000 each, by having a large number manufactured.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. I am interested in the remark the gentleman has made criticising the logic of the gentleman from New York, though I do not know whether he refers to Mr. WADSWORTH or Mr. ANDREWS. Has the gentleman taken into consideration the fact that large orders are being placed for planes abroad, and it may require the capacity of our industry to take care of these foreign orders coming in as well as the domestic production?

Mr. MAY. So far as I am concerned, I think it is a good idea, while we are not in war and are at peace with all of the world and hope to remain so, to let France and England pay the cost of the rehabilitation of our factories and get them ready to produce airplanes for us, but while doing that I would say this to the gentleman, that I have no idea that any nation can get a contract in this country to the exclusion of the American Government with any industrialist or with any department of the Government. The National Defense Act of 1920 confers upon the President ample authority to take over the factories in case of war and the existence of a necessity therefor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I am interested in the remark made about frozen specifications. I believe it is important. Can the gentleman tell us whether it is true that if a contract is let under this bill for 3,000 planes, improvements that come along in the industry in the United States in the 12 or 18 months cannot be added on to the planes before they are delivered?

Mr. MAY. I am thankful to my friend from Connecticut for asking that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended for 1 minute, that I may answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. And I say to the gentleman from Connecticut that there was no evidence that these contracts were to be let under frozen specifications.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. But on the contrary it was specifically stated that the Procurement Division of the United States War Department would take advantage of every new invention, of every new scientific discovery, and we have included in the legislation authorization for an appropriation of several million dollars for that particular purpose, in order that they may explore the field of discovery and research so that we may have the advantage of every modern improvement to make our planes up to date in every respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. I do not intend to object, because the gentleman is one of my very best friends on the minority side of the committee, but I hope when he has concluded his remarks, which I am sure will be interesting to everybody in the House, we can reach an agreement as to the limit of time on this section and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, my reason for asking for an additional 5 minutes is that out of deference to my colleagues on the committee I did not take any time in general debate on the bill. First, let me say that the members of the Committee on Military Affairs often argue and fight among themselves, but I think there is not a single member of our committee who would not fight for any other member of that committee. It is composed of a group of fine men, who have given serious thought and deep study to this particular problem. Recognizing the troublesome conditions throughout the world today, I think no one can close his eyes or bury his head in the sand like an ostrich and ignore the activities of other nations, and for that reason there is almost unanimity of opinion among members not only on the committee and of the House but, I think, of the American people as well, as to the necessity of America's increasing her armament at this particular time.

The only thing controversial in this measure is this amendment that proposes to stagger or spread the manufacture of these planes over a period of 3 or 4 years, instead of making them all at once.

I am rather surprised that most of the Members on the majority side could not accept this amendment in our committee. It seems to me there is every good argument for it. To begin with, there will be only 900 of these new planes put into the air. Thirteen hundred and fifty of them will be placed in more or less cold storage, without any personnel to man them. The first argument for spreading the program over a period of years, manufacturing not over 1,000 planes a year, is that it will give the War Department, the General Staff, and particularly the Air Corps additional time to train pilots and proper personnel to man these planes. That is the first argument for the pending amendment.

The second argument is it will lessen the strain on our annual Budget at this particular time. The sound financial condition of any country is its first line of defense. With 1,000 planes grounded, with no personnel to man them, the investment they represent, approximately \$56,000,000, is a huge sum of money that you must take into consideration when you think of the poor American taxpayers and our present alarmingly large and constantly increasing national debt.

The third reason this amendment should pass, and to my mind the most logical and convincing argument, is that it will give us the advantage of research and of experimentation, of supplying planes of the latest type, the most up to date and modern, that will not become obsolescent or perhaps obsolete by the time the last of the 3,000 are manufactured.

For these compelling reasons, I think the membership of the House should really adopt this amendment.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Supplementing what the gentleman has said in regard to these planes and the obsolescence of those that will not be in the air, there is hardly any article of manufacture of a technical nature that does not have what they call "bugs." Here they will have a chance to work those out, instead of doing as the automobile companies have done sometimes, call in thousands of machines because of some "bugs" that did not appear when they tested them out on the testing machines.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I wish we might have had perhaps some of the leaders of our great manufacturing industries appear before our committee, but I am sure you will remember as vividly as I do the time of the World War when our shipyards worked day and night turning out transports and ships that rusted and rotted in the navy yards at the conclusion of the war—almost a complete loss to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I know this bill will pass overwhelmingly. I think it should pass, whether or not this amendment is adopted, but I do hope and pray that the foreign press throughout the world, whether it is in London, Paris, Rome, Berlin, or Tokyo, will not interpret the passage of this act by the House of Representatives of the United States Congress today as any intent of this Nation's forming any alliance with any other power or of assuming the role of policeman to maintain order in the world or to settle the disputes of other countries. [Applause.]

I think it is a matter of deep concern and of even deeper regret that members of the President's official family, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture in particular, should have made the inflammatory speeches they have made recently, because you know as well as I know that no good can come of it. I know that modern science and inventions and new methods of radio, transportation, and communication have reduced this world to a miniature province. I know that Lindbergh has pushed Paris up into our front yard and that Dr. Eckener and Howard Hughes have brought Tokyo, Moscow, and Bombay within, not weeks but only a matter of days or hours, the reach of New York, Chicago, and other great cities in our country. But the indisputable fact remains and it is a fact that is a very great comfort to me, that I reflect upon with a great deal of consolation, that 3,000 miles of deep, blue water lie between the United States and Europe; 5,000 miles of deep blue water lie between the United States and Japan and the Orient. I am here to say that the Father of his Country never gave sounder advice to his fellow countrymen and to posterity than when he counseled us above all else to remain neutral, avoid entangling alliances; bear in mind that Europe has a set of primary interests, whereas we have another set of primary interests. The quarrels of the nations of the Old World, with their intense jealousies, their historic hatreds, and their own selfish interests are not our concern, and this country has no business sticking its nose into other people's affairs unless we want to get our nose smashed. [Applause.]

Let us, as we vote for this bill, give the world to understand, in spite of some remarks of aggression that have been uttered in high circles, that the people of the United States, as well as the Congress of the Nation, are voting for this program of defense only to protect our own people; not to police the world; not to tell any other nation what form of government it must have; but to serve notice upon all alien, foreign "isms" that our only concern is with Americanism, our own Constitution, the bible of our freedom and the character of our liberties, and that we are going to stay home and mind our own business. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I agree with the gentleman's statement in quoting George Washington as being opposed to any foreign entangling alliances, but does he not think he was equally right

when he said, "Adequate preparation for war is the surest guarantee of peace?"

Mr. SHORT. I most certainly do, and I am sure the chairman of the committee knows that is my position. We believe in God, but still should keep our powder dry. May we never have to use it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact we have had 6 hours general debate on this measure and that we very mutually agreed to that, I wonder if we might not reach an agreement with the other side as to debate on this section?

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, during the entire course of the debate upon this bill we have heard absolutely no opposition to the proposition that in order to establish an adequate air-defense program for the Army Air Corps we must have 5,500 planes. This has been agreed to by both sides of the aisle. The only objection that now comes is on the question as to when we should procure these planes. We have been told about the Baker Board, the Morrow Board, with their 5-year programs; and we know that although both these Boards prescribed a 5-year program for the enlargement of the Air Corps, at no time have we ever come up to the requirements of those Boards.

Here we are about to lay down a new 2-year program for the Air Corps. To judge from the arguments of our friends of the minority they would have us make of it a 5-year program. They say the contracts should be spread over a 3-year period. This means that the procurement of these airplanes would be spread out over a 4- or 5-year period, because it requires anywhere from 12 to 18 months after letting a contract before we can obtain delivery of the ships. Under the proposed legislation it will require 3 years at least if we are to obtain the necessary 3,000 ships to have a full air force of 5,500 planes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Under this amendment all the planes are to be contracted for during 2 years.

Mr. COSTELLO. I understand from the wording of the gentleman's amendment that contracts could not be let for more than 1,000 planes in any 1 year; in other words, you would have to divide the contracts up into three sections. You could not tell a single manufacturer how much business he might expect except as to 1 year; and the very purpose of this legislation is to inform American industries that they are going to have to produce so many planes—3,000—and each contractor is to be told at one time the full number of ships that he is going to produce. In this way he can gage his production and, if his plant needs enlargement, he can enlarge it. But if you tell a manufacturer that he can have only one third of his contract now, and that he may or may not get another third a year from now, and that he may or may not get the balance in the third year, no member of the industry will be able to gage his production, and the price of these planes will be increased because of this fact.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. TABER. Would not the gentleman figure that we should let contracts every year for 3,000 planes? It seems to me we are facing terrific obsolescence.

Mr. COSTELLO. That is not my purpose. The purpose of the legislation is to acquire immediately 3,000 planes to build up the strength of the Air Corps. It is admitted that the Air Corps should have this number of planes. They require them now, not 5 years from now, and the sooner we get them the better.

We have heard much talk about obsolescence, frozen contracts, frozen specifications. The fact of the matter is the Army would be getting 3,000 of the most up-to-date planes available, and every year subsequent to the completion of this program the War Department will acquire through the annual budgetary appropriations approximately 500 or 600 new planes to replace the old ships, the obsolescent ships. As a result of the annual replacements we shall be adding to the air force some 500 or 600 new planes—the latest type airplanes every year.

A question regarding these reserve ships has been raised. The statement has been made that 2,000 ships were to be held in reserve. When the Air Corps speaks of reserve ships they speak merely of planes without pilots. This does not, however, mean that the ships are stored in a barn. Eight hundred of these reserve ships are going to be training ships. They will be out at these schools. They will have no pilots. About 1,300 will be combat ships. At the present time with only 2,000 planes in the Air Corps some 240 ships are grounded for repairs and service requirements at all times. With an increased force of 5,000 planes, some 600 planes will be grounded at all times because of needing some type of repair or service. As a result, we must have a large group of reserve ships to replace those that are necessarily grounded to maintain at our various air fields the full complement required.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am painfully conscious of the fact I am to indulge in some repetition in the few minutes I may consume in discussing this amendment. I endeavored to express my views upon it yesterday in general debate.

I would like to emphasize on this occasion one or two elements of the situation upon which I did not touch yesterday. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, we are not engaged, as I understand it, in an effort to expand our Military Establishment merely to meet some situation that exists today. As I understand it, we are engaged in an effort to establish something of a policy in relation to our Military Establishment which shall hold good and be effective for some time to come. The committee bill apparently is based upon the theory that we have to have 3,000 planes as fast as we can get them. I have not heard this theory defended. I agree with the committee that we need 3,000 additional planes, but I am convinced that as we produce them we should do so in such fashion that the total authorized strength of 5,500, which is the policy number, shall be as effective from year to year and year after year as it is possible to make it. Obviously if you make your 3,000 planes on the design of 1939 or the first half of 1940, you will put the whole problem through and get the 3,000. When that program is finished, your industry stops. When it is finished the planes will begin to go through the obsolescent stage and within a short period many of them will be totally obsolete.

You will have done nothing in the authorizing legislation to establish a policy. I conceive the proper and wise policy to be something of this sort: We decide what the total number of planes shall be. As we make this decision we hope it will last for a reasonable period of time. We know that in this art obsolescence overtakes the plane very quickly. It is the great enemy of an effective air force. If we could arrange this thing so that we would build so many planes per year, build up to the 5,500 maximum strength, drop off the obsolete and build the new, then again drop off the obsolete and build the new, we would always have as a matter of continuing defense something approaching 5,500 of the best planes in the world.

It is obvious if you manufacture three-fifths of your entire air-force planes on one design, or closely related designs, at the end of this period you will not have the best possible air force in the world. We are making policy here today in our effort to increase the force. A sound policy means that it shall be a continuing policy, not merely to meet some exigency of 1939 or 1940, but looking ahead to 1943, 1944,

and 1945 and seeing to it that as this thing goes on year after year never shall our air force be overtaken and put on the ground on account of obsolescence.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SIROVICH. I was going to ask the distinguished gentleman from New York what is the period of time of obsolescence for a bombing plane, a pursuit plane, and a training plane?

Mr. THOMASON. I can answer that better by reading the testimony of General Arnold, who is, perhaps, the best authority in our country on that subject. If you will refer to page 13 of the hearings, you will find his answer as follows:

We consider the life of a bombardment plane to be longer than some of the others. Let us start from training planes. There is apparently no end to the life of a design of a training plane. A training plane can be used indefinitely because performance is not the determining factor. The determining factor is the ability to train people on that airplane.

The bombardment airplane has a much longer life than other types of combat planes. It may be that the life of a bombardment plane will be even 6 or 8 years. I doubt if it would ever be longer than 6 or 8 years. But 8 years is the absolute maximum.

An observation plane does not have to have high performance.

The pursuit plane, in order to be of any value at all, has to be better than any other plane that can be brought against it. And the life of that plane could not be much over 2 years; and 4 years is a maximum.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does not the gentleman know that the bomber that today is 6 years old is utterly outclassed by the bomber of yesterday?

Mr. THOMASON. I expect the gentleman is right, but, nevertheless, we pretend at least to be following the recommendation of the War Department in this matter, and the officers of that Department are experts on the subject.

At the risk of repetition I must go back to the proposition that was made yesterday when I submitted the argument, the suggestion, and the recommendations of the War Department, when they said that the problems to be considered in this important program were four: First, initial cost; second, the effect on the aeronautical industry; third, the purpose of the program; and, fourth, the question of maintenance.

If I may refer briefly again to the question of the program, may I say that the War Department's own language on that subject is as follows:

The proposed 5,000-airplane program is intended to insure the establishment and equipment of an adequate air arm as soon as possible and provide the necessary war reserve. A true war reserve for the Air Corps does not consist of airplanes alone. In addition to reserve personnel it requires an adequate research and development program and an industry which can produce aircraft in quantity.

The War Department says that is necessary. General Arnold states that he needs this program in 2 years, and I cannot understand why we should fuss and argue here over the question of an additional year.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. But it was testified before our committee that the reason they wanted these planes now is because they feared perhaps in another Congress they would not get the appropriation.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman from Missouri—

Mr. SHORT. Was not that the testimony given?

Mr. THOMASON. That is the testimony, but the gentleman does not seem to be willing to admit that this is nothing in the world but an authorization.

Any man who reads the newspapers today must know world conditions, and when you add to the world situation the testimony of the representatives of our own War Department, I think we ought to take their advice instead of in-

jecting a political angle into the situation. We ought not to play politics with national defense. [Applause.]

Mr. SHORT. Let me say to the gentleman that no political angle has been injected at all. I asked General Arnold himself two questions:

General, don't you think before any foreign power could successfully attack the United States—

Mr. THOMASON. I yielded for a question, not a speech.

The gentleman from Missouri is an excellent and an eloquent speaker. I only wish the gentleman from Missouri would do as the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] have done, and give careful study to the hearings. The gentleman would find that not only General Arnold, the Chief of the Air Corps, but General Craig, and every man in the War Department and on the General Staff has said we need this program now. If conditions change next year we still have a Committee on Appropriations that can chop off the appropriations. This is a question of what our experts, our trusted advisers, tell us to do on this subject. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to follow them, and that is what I believe the House ought to do.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact that 800 of the 3,000 planes will have practically no period of obsolescence since they are to be used as training planes?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; I think that is true. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman as a member of the committee will recall that I asked General Arnold two questions; first:

Don't you think before any foreign power could successfully attack this country it would be quite necessary for them to have bases either in Canada, Mexico, or some nearby land?

He added, "Or floating bases."

I said, "Absolutely." That is my opinion as well as the general's—

Do you think there is any great danger of immediate attack from any source?

He answered:

I do not think I ought to answer that question.

Although General Craig promised us that he would answer it, the question was never answered. The thought of America being attacked by any particular power at this time is so silly and ludicrous that it should not even be considered.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I do not have the floor.

Mr. CLASON. Let me make my statement first.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring home to the House the fact that the Air Corps is asking the Seventy-sixth Congress at its first session to give it the right to order 4,054 planes out of 5,500, 3,032 planes beyond the 1,022 now on order or intended to be ordered under the regular Budget.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. No; I do not have time.

I also wish to point out the fact that on page 5 General Craig told us that of the 5,500 planes to be built 2,163 are to be in reserve. The reason they are to be in reserve is that the Air Corps does not have pilots for them. The fact is they do not have airfields for them and it is going to take them 2 years to get the airfields. It is going to take them more than 2 years to get the pilots, according to the statement the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] just read. It will be only 2 years until the pursuit planes, of which 1,335 are to be in reserve, will be absolutely obsolete,

under General Arnold's own testimony. What is the sense of rushing ahead with a program like that?

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] simply provides in a reasonable manner that we will get up to within 2,000 of the 5,500 planes within a reasonable length of time. We will have 2,163 planes in reserve under this program without any pilots and without airfields for them. Now, let us be reasonable. Let us not order 4,054 planes in the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress. Let us spread it over next year and succeeding years.

You will see, on page 17 of the report, just what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] referred to when he stated that a general before the committee stated that in his idea the whole argument behind this program is to "take as much as they can get now." That is the whole story about this program. Let us be sensible and adopt this amendment.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MERRITT. I believe the gentleman realizes from the hearings that we have enough airports to take care of 5,000 airplanes.

Mr. CLASON. I asked that question of General Arnold when he was on the stand, and he ducked and would not tell us where the airports were.

Mr. MERRITT. Does not the gentleman from Massachusetts know it is in the record?

Mr. CLASON. No; I do not know it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Is it not a fact that we presently have authorization for 4,120 planes, and this is simply an authorization for 1,380 additional planes?

Mr. CLASON. That is true; it is an authorization for 1,380 more planes.

Mr. BROOKS. Is it not a fact that about 800 of these additional planes will be used as training planes and there will be no obsolescence in connection with them?

Mr. CLASON. I have no idea except what is in the evidence here as to how many are going to be used as training planes. What they tell us is that when a plane becomes obsolete they can use it as a training plane. On that basis we are going to pay for 1,300 first-class pursuit planes and 2 years from now when we get the pilots the planes will become training planes. Why not be reasonable and just buy what we need for military purposes at this time?

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. The gentleman understands the planes which are put in reserve will not be taken out of commission in the sense that they will not be used but will be assigned to the depots and tactical units of the Air Corps so they will be a reserve of planes which will be usable when other planes are taken out for major or minor repairs.

Mr. CLASON. Yes; but it is absolutely unnecessary on the testimony. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I hope we will not play politics with the safety of our Nation. During the last 10 minutes there was handed to me by the International Press Service a dispatch just received from London. I would like to read it:

Plainly implying Great Britain's determination to go the limit in facing any threat to the Empire, the Government tonight issued an official White Paper announcing huge increases in rearmament expenses. The next budget for the fighting services will contain provision for expenditures of £523,000,000 sterling, approximately \$2,615,000,000, according to the White Paper which was issued simultaneously with the revelation that a new strain has been placed on Anglo-Italian relations by Rome's admission of heavy troop movements in Libya. The total expenditures will bring the total well above the \$7,500,000,000 originally estimated for the 5-year period from April 1937.

LXXXIV—91

Believe as you may, we stand here at this hour to argue whether or not this Nation shall be equipped with 5,500 planes in either 2 years, which it is admitted is necessary to build them, or in 3 or 4 years. For my part, for my Nation, for my boy, I want to say that the wheels of the factories cannot turn fast enough to provide this Nation with adequate defense at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. As a matter of fact, even if this bill carries a provision for 5,500 planes, only planes can be manufactured that the Committee on Appropriations appropriates the money for.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. And if it is found when they go before the Committee on Appropriations that they cannot justify the construction of the 5,500 planes within, say, 1 year, the committee will not give them the money.

Mr. PACE. And even if the money is appropriated it will be 1941 before they can be delivered.

Mr. COCHRAN. This is simply an authorization and not an appropriation.

Mr. PACE. Nothing else.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Aside from the practicability of the needed program of 5,500 planes, I feel sure it is the gentleman's conclusion that today, now, is the time for us to say to the other nations of the world that we expect to move forward in this respect, and properly prepare to defend our great Nation.

Mr. PACE. Exactly, that we intend to defend ourselves. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman and my fellow Members, I desire to congratulate this House upon the splendid debate, or rather upon the splendid arguments that have been made during the consideration of this bill, and the high plane upon which debate has been carried along. A few strains of partisanship have come into this discussion. Of course, we expect our friend from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] to always bring in more or less partisanship in any speech that he makes upon any subject at any time. [Applause.]

Mr. SHORT. I plead guilty to the charge.

Mr. RAYBURN. But I do feel proud of the House of Representatives for the general type and character of the speeches that have been made.

Much has been said about recognizing world conditions. A man would be more than blind in his eyes if he did not realize that there is a serious world condition. He would be less than far-seeing if he did not remember 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917, when America was smugly sitting here with a great ocean on either side, believing that the allied armies would defeat the Germans within such a reasonable time that we would never be called upon to participate in that conflict. Conditions in Europe are more volcanic today than they were in the early part of 1914. The world is living closer together; and wherever the frontier of America may be—and we today are not compelled to name it—I believe I speak the mind of the inarticulate millions out there who expect us to speak for them when I say that wherever that frontier may be, the people of this land want America to be prepared to defend that frontier. [Applause.]

The amendment that is now pending would be amazing to me if it did not have the support of some of the gentlemen who have spoken for it. I especially refer to my good friend from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], whose sanity I came to know well as a member of the great committee that I had the privilege to preside over. The gentleman does not seem to realize, however, that this is an authorization bill. I agree with him that this is a policy bill. Why say that we must build a thousand planes this year or never build them; why build a thousand next year or never build them? Why not commit this to the Congress to pass upon when appropriation

bills come into this House. It might not be necessary or it might not be feasible to build more than 500 planes the first year, and the second year it might be necessary for the defense of this country and for the peace of the world for the United States of America to build 2,500 planes. [Applause.] It might be necessary before the summer that faces us is over that America should set in motion the forces that will build the 3,000 planes in the next 12 months in order to let the world know that America in planes, in ships, in men, and in equipment for those men is ready to meet a world in arms, because, as a great Speaker of this House once said:

The American people are the most peaceable people in the world; but when aroused by injustice and by invasion of their rights, they become the most warlike people in the world, willing, if necessary to protect their rights and their liberties, to meet a world in arms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDREWS) there were—ayes 127, noes 169.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. MAY and Mr. ANDREWS to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 136, noes 183.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. When the facilities of the Army for instruction and training in aviation are deemed by the Secretary of War to be insufficient he may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, and without reference to any limitation contained in section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535), detail personnel of the Regular Army as students at any technical, professional, or other educational institution, or as students, observers, or investigators at such industrial plants or other places as shall be best suited to enable such personnel to acquire a knowledge of or experience in the specialties incident to aviation in which the training of such personnel is essential: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States in addition to the authorized emoluments of the personnel so detailed except for the cost of tuition at such educational institutions, and the cost of maintenance of necessary personnel who may be detailed as supervisors or inspectors and of the equipment assigned to them for their official use: *Provided further*, That the tuition for the personnel during the period of their detail may be paid from any funds made available for the procurement branches.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 3, line 10, after the word "funds", insert the words "which may hereafter be."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War, in his discretion and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to enroll as students at the Air Corps Training Center, for the pursuit of such courses of instruction as may be prescribed therefor, such civilians, upon their own applications, as may be selected from the instructional staffs of those civilian flying schools which have been accredited by the War Department for the education, experience, and training of personnel of the Military Establishment: *Provided*, That except for the furnishing of such supplies, matériel, or equipment as may be necessary for training purposes, the training of such students shall be without cost to the United States: *Provided further*, That in case of injury to or sickness of such students, hospital or medical treatment may be given in Government hospitals, but shall be without expense to the United States other than for services of Medical Department personnel and the use of hospital equipment, not including medicines or supplies: *And provided further*, That the United States shall be under no obligation in respect to payment of a pension, compensation, or other gratuity to the dependents of any such student who dies of disease or injury while undergoing such training, nor to any such student in the event of personal injury sustained by him.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, strike out lines 4 to 9, inclusive.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, some of you will recall that I referred particularly to this section in my address under general debate. My amendment is to strike out the proviso beginning in line 4, page 4. The explanation was made that this applies to instructors of civilian flying schools who are sent to the Army training center for training on war planes, so that they can go back and direct the training of students who will come into these private schools. No explanation has given me any good reason why, if these men are willing to give their services—and I note in section 3 they are to be given at no cost to the Government—they at least should have medicines and supplies if they should have the misfortune to sustain injury or even death while undergoing training in Texas.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. COSTELLO. If the gentleman's amendment should prevail, it would give to these civilian pilots the same pensions and compensation as members of the military personnel are now granted, and yet they would be merely civilian instructors temporarily detailed to Randolph Field for a short course in order to learn how the military is training their pilots for the Army. They are not members of the Regular Army, and yet if the gentleman's amendment should prevail, they would be liable to receive the same pension and compensation as a member of the Army.

Mr. MILLER. It seems to me that if they offer their services for this purpose, they should receive compensation. It may take only 10 seconds for an instructor to crash and become totally disabled. I believe there is an obligation on the part of the Government to care for them in that case.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that when these men go to Randolph Field they have to accept the regulations of the Army?

Mr. MILLER. I assume so.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And they are on the pay roll of the Federal Government.

Mr. MILLER. Yes. That is the question in my mind. The question is about what the other section means, that these services shall be given at no cost to the Government.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Are they there at their own expense?

Mr. MILLER. Possibly.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And they are supposed to return home and train pilots.

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Therefore I say they should be given the same consideration as the Army men.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. My understanding is that the purpose of this section is to train men whose profession is now training pilots. They now have their own planes and are training pilots in these civilian schools.

The pilots are paying tuition. They are professors in these civilian schools, such as the Park School. Those men are being paid for their services by those schools. They are civilians. They are not connected in any way with the Government, but because the War Department under this bill will use these schools by sending students to the schools and paying the tuition of those students, they want the instructors to have an opportunity to improve their own ability to train the students. So they offer the instructors, at the expense of the instructors, the opportunity of taking part in the courses of instruction at the Army schools. They are in no way connected with the Army. They are not paid by the Army. They are not paid by the Army when they go back to instruct, except indirectly, because the school in which they are teaching is paid the tuition of the students who are there from the Army. They are professors in private schools. That is their status. They are offered an opportunity to improve their own ability to teach, by taking the course in

the Army school. They do not obtain any enlisted status. They are offered this opportunity in order to give them a chance to give better instruction in their private schools, as though they were professors in a university, if the university was paying them and not the Army.

Mr. MILLER. I grant what the gentleman says is true, but the gentleman will agree that they are undertaking a very hazardous occupation to aid the Government in developing this air program. It is essential. It is necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. That is incidental, however, to their own profession. They are already flying instructors.

Mr. MILLER. Certainly. May I say the same thing applies to any cadet who goes to Randolph. He is there for training to possibly follow that as a vocation afterward.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. But they are not cadets.

Mr. MILLER. No.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. I would very much prefer to yield my 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SMITH]. I do not want to retard anything, but I want this clear. I will make this one statement: If these men are offering their services to go to Randolph Field to improve their technique and to make possible the training of these youngsters, I believe while they are there they are entitled to the protection of the Government. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut for an answer to that.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Those men are not covered by this section. Those men are professors in private schools. That is their regular profession. They are flying teachers not now connected with the Army. If they are offered an opportunity to improve their own technique in instruction, without cost to the Government, at their own expense by going to the Government school, does the gentleman think they still should be treated the same as the cadets who are in there under obligation to the Government when they enter into their contract of enlistment or when they accept a commission in the Army as officers?

Mr. MILLER. I must answer the question in the affirmative. I think they are, if they are going to devote their services to training these youngsters.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment merely to suggest that if the words proposed to be stricken by this amendment were stricken out of the bill, the effect of other provisions of the bill would have the effect of adopting a new policy of paying pensions and compensation to civilians not in the Government service.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. If this legislation is passed with those lines contained therein, Members of the House of Representatives will find it impossible to get approval of legislation that would provide for the compensation of dependents of men who may be killed or injured while acting under orders of officers of the Air Corps. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] can speak eloquently on this subject. He knows what it means to have an accident occur when acting under orders of the United States Army. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SMITH] spoke of comparative hazards. If those hazards are created by the order of an Army officer, it is my contention that the man who is injured should be entitled to compensation.

Some of you may remember that last year we found difficulty in passing a bill for the benefit of a widow of a Reserve officer who was in an Army plane, going up for practice purposes. He was killed, and it proved impossible for us to

enact into law a bill for the benefit of his widow. If this provision stays in the bill, it will constitute an objection that you will see cited in adverse reports upon private claims for the benefit of these instructors if injured.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. I may say in reference to the question raised by the gentleman from South Dakota that the bill contains another provision for the compensation and retirement of Reserve officers on the same basis as Regular officers, but in that case the officer is under the control, as the gentleman has said, of the Army. These instructors would not be under Army control.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I call the gentleman's attention to the report which states:

The utilization of civilian training schools will materially reduce the time required for the expansion of our Air Corps.

In other words, this plan is for the benefit of the Air Corps. The instructors are to be given hospital care. If they die, why not be fair to their dependents? The bill itself by its provisions calls attention to the dangers faced by these civilians who place themselves under Army officers for training and subject themselves to the hazards of Army equipment. They may fly in experimental ships. They will be subject to identical hazards with men for whom we accept responsibility. So it seems to me the Government should recognize an obligation to assist these men in case of injury or their dependents in case of death. There is no cheap way to prepare for war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized, in his discretion and under rules, regulations, and limitations to be prescribed by him, to lend to accredited civilian aviation schools at which personnel of the Military Establishment are pursuing a course of education and training pursuant to detail thereto under competent orders of the War Department, out of aircraft, aircraft parts, aeronautical equipment and accessories for the Air Corps, on hand and belonging to the Government, such articles as may appear to be required for instruction, training, and maintenance purposes.

SEC. 5. Section 1 of the act entitled "An act to amend the National Defense Act," approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the President is hereby authorized to call annually, with their consent, upon application to and selection by the War Department, for a period of not more than 1 year for any one officer, for active duty with the Regular Army, such numbers of Reserve officers, in the grade of second lieutenant, as are necessary to maintain on active duty at all times not more than 1,000 Reserve officers of the promotion-list branches other than the Air Corps, not more than 3,000 Reserve officers of the Air Corps, and not more than 300 Reserve officers of the non-promotion-list branches: *Provided*, That in the non-promotion-list branches and the Judge Advocate General's Department, such Reserve officers may be in any grade not above captain: *Provided further*, That until July 1, 1949, the tour of active duty of Air Corps Reserve officers may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be extended not to exceed a total of 7 years' active service in all, and thereafter not to exceed a total of 5 years' active service in all: *Provided further*, That in the non-promotion-list branches and the Judge Advocate General's Department, the tour of active duty may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be extended not to exceed a total of 2 years' active service in all: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall require the termination of active duty of any Reserve officer because of promotion to a higher grade after his tour of active duty begins. The tour of any Reserve Corps officer on active duty may be terminated at any time, in the discretion of the Secretary of War": *Provided further*, That all officers (including warrant officers) and all enlisted men of the National Guard, Reserve Corps, or any other armed forces of the United States, however designated, other than the officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, if called into the active military service by the Federal Government for extended military service in excess of 30 days, and suffer disability or death in line of duty from disease or injury while so employed, they shall be deemed to have been in the active military service during such period and shall be in all respects upon the same footing as to pensions, compensation, retirement pay, and hospital benefits as officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service of the Regular Army.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 5, line 25, after the word "War", insert a period and strike out the colon and all the language down to and including the word "Army" on page 6, line 13.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, all I desire to say about this amendment is that the provision sought to be stricken out was inserted in the bill at the very close of the consideration of amendments by the Military Affairs Committee without any hearing whatever, and without any report from either the War Department or the Veterans' Administration. Upon further investigation and since the amendment was injected into the legislation, I have conferred with the War Department and procured an expression of views from them on the subject.

In addition to this, I call attention to one particular provision of the bill as contained in this amendment which I have moved to strike. The language on page 6, line 1, reads as follows:

All enlisted men of the National Guard, Reserve Corps, or any other armed force of the United States, however designated, other than the officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, if called into the active military service by the Federal Government for extended service—

And so forth. Under this provision of the bill as written, with the amendment in it, the bill would be extended to the Navy of the United States, to the Coast Guard, and to the Reserve Corps, even when they are detailed to service in the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Not only that, but it goes so far as to set up retirement benefits, death benefits, and compensation to a group of men who may have been in the service not over 30 days as against men who do not have the same benefits under the present retirement law although they may have been in the service as long as 15 or 20 years.

I am advised by the War Department that if this language remains in the bill it will start the program off with an additional cost of approximately \$500,000 a year, and over the years will run into many millions of dollars. The Budget Director has not even been consulted about it.

There is pending before the House Committee on Military Affairs an unconsidered bill, H. R. 3220, which I introduced at the request of the War Department. The War Department has no disposition to mistreat any Reserve officer, but they think that to establish such a policy as that which would be established by this provision to which I refer in the pending bill would apply to both the War Department and the Veterans' Administration and make it very difficult to handle the subject of proper retirement and proper compensation to the officers of the Reserve Corps who are and will be entitled to compensation under existing law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman's amendment, then, take from this bill the protection for the Reserve officers which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SMITH] told me the bill contained when I was speaking on the other amendment?

Mr. MAY. It will take that provision from the bill; and the purpose of striking it out is to enable the Military Affairs Committee of the House to hold hearings on legislation that is pending before them so that they can intelligently consider the matter after hearing both sides and make a proper report to the House of Representatives on legislation which carries not merely compensation and death benefits and injury benefits, but carries with it these vast retirement privileges not contemplated in existing legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What assurance can the gentleman give us that the committee will report that bill favorably and give us a chance to enact a law that will grant benefits to those who crash while under orders of the War Department?

Mr. MAY. In my judgment, there is no sentiment against treating Reserve officers with the same justice as Regular

officers; and I am sure every Member of the House Committee will see that a fair hearing is had.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has offered this amendment at the command of the War Department General Staff to strike out an amendment that was adopted by the Military Affairs Committee by a vote, as I recall, of 18 to 6.

The bill the gentleman from Kentucky refers to that is going to take care of these men that are cracked up when in training, these 4,300 officers of the Reserve Corps and National Guard, H. R. 3220, is a lot of bunk.

It puts an Army officer who is injured under the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and if any of you have ever had a constituent injured on a Federal project and got over 15 cents out of that outfit, I would like to see the record.

The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs says this will apply to the Marine Corps and Navy. The Marine Corps and Navy already have the benefit. Why take the three main branches of our national defense and treat two of them in one manner and the Army in another?

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman want me to answer the question? I will do so.

Mr. EDMISTON. All right; answer it.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman stated that H. R. 3220 is pure bunk.

Mr. EDMISTON. It is.

Mr. MAY. How is he going to find out whether it is bunk or not until we hold hearings on it?

Mr. EDMISTON. I say when any Army officer or enlisted man of the United States is injured in line of duty, or in the service of his country, he should not have to look to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for compensation for his injury. You are putting him alongside of the fellow who gets hit in the foot with a pick on a W. P. A. ditch.

You are drawing 3,000 young officers into the Air Service. It is a hazardous service. When we used the officers to carry the mail and put them into that service of carrying the mail, we provided this same provision in that bill. That provision carried in the House and Senate in 1933. We recognized the hazards of the service then, and this is just as hazardous a service, if not more so, because those were trained officers, with no equipment to fly the mail. They were trained. These are youngsters who are going to be trained. You are going to crack them up and you are going to kill them.

Do you know what their beneficiaries would get under existing law? The most they could get if the officer is killed would be \$45 a month, and the most a widow may get would be \$28 per month.

Let us consider two officers, one a Regular Army officer and one a Reserve officer in the same plane, on the same mission and under the same orders. The plane cracks up and both of them are injured to the same degree. The Regular Army officer is retired for life on two-thirds of the pay of one grade in advance and the fellow officer in the Reserve or in the National Guard flying with him gets what he can out of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. As I understand the import of the gentleman's proposition it is to place a Reserve officer who is called into extended active duty in the Air Corps on the same basis of retirement pay that a Regular Army officer draws in case of injury?

Mr. EDMISTON. That is exactly correct. The Army is the only branch of our national defense that does not now enjoy this privilege, and the War Department can give you no argument against this thing. The thing they are afraid of, and I want you to know this, is the cost. They say it

will cost \$500,000 the first year. It will not cost them a nickel if they do not crack up the boys or kill them.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Did the gentleman even ask the clerk of the committee or the chairman of the committee or anybody in the War Department for a report on his amendment when he offered it in committee? Did he not offer it at the very last minute of the consideration of the bill?

Mr. EDMISTON. I notified the committee I was going to offer the amendment. I offered it and the committee agreed to it.

Mr. MAY. When did the gentleman give notice to the War Department that he was going to offer it?

Mr. EDMISTON. I do not pay any attention to the War Department. I know they are against it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in defense of the language proposed to be stricken from the bill of the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky. The retention in the bill of this language is nothing more than simple justice.

A Reserve officer called to active duty in the Air Corps, or anywhere else, who is killed in the proper performance of that duty is just as dead as a Regular officer killed under the same circumstances. If he leaves a family, most likely he leaves the family under similar circumstances as that of a Regular Army officer of like grade and like length of service. Whatever may be the condition of his family, they are entitled to the protection of this Government just the same as is the family of a Regular officer.

Anyone in the Reserve Corps who comes out to serve his country, although it may be in a training period, does so very often at a sacrifice of his time and money. He furnishes the most unselfish service to his country of any man who serves the Nation. In his own time and at his own expense he goes through a period of training that is most valuable to this Nation, and by the unselfish service rendered to the Nation by such individuals it does away with the necessity of maintaining in this Nation an army such as we find maintained in foreign countries at tremendous expense. Largely because of the service of the Reserve officers, we are able to maintain a system of national defense with only a small standing Army. The Officers' Reserve Corps is the framework upon which we can build the Army we must raise in case of necessity. Therefore, if we are going to have an esprit de corps in the Officers' Reserve Corps, if we are going to have them give unselfishly in the future as they have in the past, we certainly should give them the same protection, if they are injured in the proper performance of their duty, as we extend to the Regular officers in connection with this service.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman think it is fair to afford the same rights and privileges to a man who has been in the service for a day or two only and happens to get hurt as against a man who has been in the service for 10 years and has served for all these years?

Mr. FADDIS. I say to the gentleman, "Yes." I say to the gentleman that although this man may have been in the service only a few days he has come there to render to his Government just as much service as he is capable of rendering, and his life is just as valuable to him as the life of a man who has been educated at West Point is to him. His life is just as valuable to him, because he has paid for his own education, as if the Government had paid for it, and he is entitled to the full benefit of all the protection this Government can give him.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman believe that a man who has been in the service for 3 days and has been hurt is as much entitled to retirement pay as a man who has served 15 years?

Mr. FADDIS. If he is in a war or engaged in any other hazardous duty; yes, indeed, he is.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that this service the men will be entering is an extremely hazardous service?

Mr. FADDIS. That is quite true.

May I answer the gentleman from Kentucky further by saying that this is a poor place to quibble about instances of that kind. It might have been written into the bill and properly taken care of in the proper time.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman mentioned the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON]. The situation now, however, is that this provision for the protection of these officers is in the bill.

Mr. FADDIS. Yes. The gentleman from West Virginia placed it in there in committee.

Mr. HEALEY. If we wish to keep the provision in the bill we will vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. FADDIS. Exactly.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that this demand represents a feeling that has existed for years between the officers of the Regular Establishments of either the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps and the officers in the Reserve Corps?

Mr. FADDIS. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky is defeated.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in accord with all the statements made by my friends on the committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] but this is not a question of how this proviso got in the bill but a question of just what it means and how wide its scope. If the gentleman from West Virginia would so amend the section which he offered in the closing minutes of the committee's sessions and state that all men brought into the service as a result of this particular act shall have the benefit of retirement pay and benefits, same would have my very cordial support. However, I invite the attention of the committee to the very, very broad language of this amendment:

That all officers (including warrant officers) and all enlisted men of the National Guard, Reserve Corps, or any other armed forces of the United States, however designated, other than the officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, if called into the active military service by the Federal Government for extended military service for 30 days—

Mr. EDMISTON. Or more.

Mr. THOMASON. Or more, shall receive the benefits of the present Retirement Act.

The Congress in the past has had a good deal of experience with legislation regarding retired emergency officers, and some of it none too pleasant. I find myself in sympathy with the purpose the gentleman has in mind, but I also find myself in accord with my chairman, who states that a matter of this importance, concerning which the War Department through the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff state there ought to be hearings both on the part of the War Department and the Veterans' Administration to see that justice is done not only to the officers and men but also to the Treasury of the United States, and such broad legislation should not be passed without hearings and deliberation.

I say this is not an unreasonable request, when the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs comes on the floor of the House and says he will see to it that there will be hearings and that the matter will be decided upon its merits

and legislation adopted that will do justice to everybody. Therefore, I believe either this language ought to be modified to cover only the officers brought in as a result of this measure, or else we should have a full and fair hearing and come in here with legislation on the subject. This is the fair way to do it, as I view it, and in saying this I do not want to be understood as being in opposition to providing retired benefits for the young officers who are brought into the aviation branch of the service by reason of this act. In fact, I will support fair and just legislation to provide retirement benefits for all officers and enlisted men, but I want to be sure we do not go back to the abuses of the old days.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. EDMISTON. Did we not hold hearings during the last session on this identical principle as embodied in the emergency officers' retirement bill? We spent weeks on those hearings.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman knows what happened to that bill.

Mr. EDMISTON. We passed it here, and the President vetoed it. That is what happened to it.

Mr. THOMASON. I know; but the bill did not become law.

Mr. EDMISTON. That still does not make it right.

Mr. THOMASON. No; perhaps not; but I say we ought not just absolutely open the floodgates here by a special provision inserted into what might be termed an emergency aviation and army bill. This is a national-defense bill. I hope we can bring in a special bill dealing with the subject of retirement that will be so fair and just that it will not be vetoed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sure the gentleman would not want us to think this provision gives retirement pay without some cause for it. The provision requires that the officers must suffer disability or death in line of duty.

Mr. THOMASON. Certainly; but any legislation on such an important subject should not be discriminatory or all-inclusive.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Why should you discriminate between the Reserve officer and the Regular officer who might happen to be injured or killed in the same ship or under the same circumstances?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not draw that line. That is not the issue involved here. I believe the record will show that the Reserve officers do not have a better friend than I.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman believe the Reserve officers should be given added protection? The Regular Army officers are in training every day, all their lives, while the Reserve officers do not have that opportunity of training to protect themselves.

Mr. THOMASON. I agree with you and I favor legislation on the subject, but I believe it ought to be seasoned legislation. Certainly, hearings ought to be had, including all interested parties, the Reserve Officers' Association, the National Guard, the Veterans' Administration, and the War Department, to the end that a bill may be worked out that will be fair not only to the officers who may be injured or killed in service but to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. I understand the statement has been made here that protection similar to that provided for in the so-called Edmiston amendment to the bill is now given to officers and enlisted men of the Navy and of the Marine Corps. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not know the details. I am sure there is some law that gives them some benefits, but I am also sure that it is not so general or far-reaching as this provision. I think we need legislation on the subject, and I will support it, but in my judgment this bill should only cover those brought in by this act. I hope the gentleman from West Virginia will so amend, and I will support it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not entirely clear about what the provision referred to in the bill actually covers but if it is intended to protect Reserve officers who are injured while in the service, then I am most emphatically against the amendment to strike out, offered by my friend the chairman of the committee.

I know a specific instance where a Reserve officer, as fine a gentleman as ever lived and as patriotic an individual as ever served his Government, went up at Selfridge Field in what they call a 2-to-1 dog fight under orders, and was hopelessly and helplessly injured. A bill to make him a captain and to retire him was passed here, I believe, twice, but because the War Department reported on it adversely to the White House the bill was vetoed.

How long is this Committee going to stand idly by and permit patriotic citizens who are rendering a service to their Government, whether in the air or otherwise, to be maimed or crippled and made helpless for life without some provision being made for them? The War Department assumes the attitude that only the lives of Regular officers are precious. I am personally resentful about this matter, and I believe this House should once and for all determine this question and show the War Department that others are entitled to some consideration. If a private pension bill covering a meritorious case is passed by Congress, the War Department vetoes it by an adverse recommendation. Thus a superlegislative action overrides Congress.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I suppose the gentleman heard my statement made awhile ago that the War Department had suggested legislation to take care of these very people, and that I had assured the gentleman that he should have a hearing on it.

Mr. DINGELL. The War Department for a long time has neglected its duty in respect of this matter and it is about time they recommended some remedy.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman think that far-reaching legislation involving the matter of retirement should be brought up in this way and considered without any hearing, or should be written on the floor here?

Mr. DINGELL. It should not be written here on the floor, but the Committee should see to it that these people are protected. Their lives and their patriotism are just as essential to the Nation as the lives or the patriotism of the men in the Regular Army. If the gentleman will assure me that he will go along in trying to correct some of the inequities of the present law and will seek to control the selfishness of the War Department, or rather certain individuals in it, then I could go along with him in his effort to strike out the section in order that legislation properly considered could be brought before the House at a later date.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is now getting around to my position, because that is exactly what I want to do. I think we should have adequate hearings and give everybody a chance to be considered.

Mr. DINGELL. But I will say to my friend that I do not want to wait 10 years, because we are 20 years behind right now.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I want to ask the gentleman this question: I am in sympathy with what the gentleman wants, but assuming the case the gentleman spoke of about the young man who cracked up on Selfridge Field and had only been called out for service for 10 days, under this provision

in the bill he would not get any retirement pay because it applies only to service in excess of 30 days.

Mr. DINGELL. I will answer the gentleman by saying that I think if he was in the service 1 day or if he went up in a plane for the first time and was killed or injured in 30 minutes, he should be compensated.

Mr. BULWINKLE. But we are dealing here with this particular provision in the pending bill.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. EDMISTON. I will explain the 30-day provision. That was to take out the Reserve officer who is called into the service for a 2 weeks' training period. This does not apply to him, but when they call upon him for extended duty of 30 days or longer, he goes in on the same basis as a Regular Army officer.

Mr. DINGELL. I am glad to have that statement from the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that if we were to adopt the policy incorporated in the pending bill, we would make a great contribution to national defense by encouraging these officers to keep their Reserve commissions with the Government?

Mr. DINGELL. I would think so, but there seems to be some controversy about the section and on the assurance of the chairman of the committee that proper legislation will be brought out, squaring with my ideas, I am considering I might vote with him.

Mr. EDMISTON. Have you not been waiting for it for 20 years?

Mr. DINGELL. I agree with that statement.

Mr. EDMISTON. You will never get it that way.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman would assume that the same sentiment would exist when he grants hearings as exists now.

Mr. DINGELL. That might be his opinion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think those who favor this legislation, who have been fighting for it for years, now that we have it in this bill, ought to keep it in the bill. [Applause.]

We are not trying to put an amendment into the bill. We are trying to stop the chairman of the committee from striking out a part of the bill as reported to the House. Therefore, we on both sides of the aisle, are supporting the committee report.

Now, my distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee, says we should introduce a separate bill. Oh, yes, I know he will give it a hearing, but if his committee were to report out a separate bill to reach the same objective, you and I know, as practical Members of the House, that the invisible opposition of the Department along the line would ultimately kill the bill. Also, with this provision in the pending bill we need not worry about any veto.

This provision is logical, this provision is fair, and the committee exercised proper judgment and good judgment in reporting the bill out with this provision in it. Do not let us take any chances on having a separate bill introduced, with separate hearings upon it, and then when that bill comes out, having it meet with invisible opposition along the line that such a bill will encounter. Let us keep the present language in the bill which the chairman of the committee now undertakes to strike out. Then, if it stays in the bill as it goes to the White House, we who have favored this legislation for years, with the hope of having it enacted into law, will have accomplished the objective we have so long sought.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman favor a policy of writing legislation by putting an amendment in a bill without hearings of any kind whatsoever or without consulting the vari-

ous agencies that are to enforce it, especially far-reaching legislation of this character?

Mr. McCORMACK. This matter has been considered for years.

Mr. MAY. By whom?

Mr. McCORMACK. Apparently when the committee reported this out the Members of the House were justified in assuming that your committee had given it consideration; otherwise it would not have been included in the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, is it not only right and proper when a measure like this comes out proposing to bring into the active service several thousand young Reserve officers, that the same provision be made in the bill and adequate opportunity given them?

Mr. McCORMACK. A well-rounded-out program, as contemplated by this bill, should include a provision of that kind, and the committee is to be congratulated for having included it. Let us all support the committee by keeping it in the bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were—ayes 39, noes 149.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. Section 2 of the said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That for the period of 10 years, beginning July 1, 1939, the Secretary of War is authorized to select annually, to be commissioned in the Regular Army in approximately equal annual increments, in accordance with the provisions of, and from the groups described in, section 24e of the National Defense Act, as amended, such proportion of the total number of officers as, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, will be required to bring the commissioned personnel of the Regular Army to peacetime strength, as hereinafter provided, on June 30, 1949."

SEC. 7. Section 24e of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 774), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Except as otherwise herein provided, all appointments in the Regular Army shall be made in the grade of second lieutenant from the following groups: Group 1, from graduates of the United States Military Academy; group 2, from warrant officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army who have had at least 2 years' service; group 3, from honor graduates of the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; group 4, from members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and flying cadets, who during the current calendar year have completed 1 year's active duty, under the provisions of this act, which duty may include service as a flying cadet in the Air Corps Training Center; and group 5, from officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard, members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and graduates of technical institutions approved by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That, after all qualified members of group 1 have been appointed, appointments from the second, third, fourth, and fifth groups shall be made in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, from persons between the ages of 21 and 30 years: *Provided further*, That the number to be selected from each of the second, third, fourth, and fifth groups, and the number to be assigned to each branch of the service within the limits prescribed by law from all groups shall be determined by the Secretary of War in his discretion: *Provided further*, That until June 30, 1949, the total number of officers to be appointed annually from group 4, not including flying cadets, in the promotion list branches other than the Air Corps shall be not less than 10 percent of the total number of Reserve officers of such branches other than the Air Corps authorized to be called annually under appropriation acts, and in no event less than 50, and that any officers added to the Army under existing authorizations shall be within the total authorized commissioned strength of 16,719: *And provided further*, That immediately upon the effective date of this act, the President is authorized to commission not to exceed 300 second lieutenants in the Air Corps of the Regular Army, from among Reserve officers and flying cadets who have qualified for such appointment under existing laws. Any vacancy in the grade of captain in the Judge Advocate General's department, not filled by transfer or detail from another branch, may, in the discretion of the President, be filled by appointment from Reserve judge advocates between the ages of 30 and 36 years, and such appointee shall be placed upon the promotion list immediately below the junior captain on said list. Appointments in the Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps in the grade of first lieutenant shall be made from Reserve Medical, Dental, and Veterinary officers, respectively, between the ages of 23 and 32 years. Appointments in the Medical Administrative Corps shall be made in the grade of second lieutenant from pharmacists between the ages of 21 and 32 years who are graduates of recognized schools or colleges of pharmacy requiring 4 years of instruction for

graduation, under such regulations and after such examination as the Secretary of War shall prescribe. To be eligible for appointment in the Dental Corps, a candidate must be a graduate of a recognized dental college, and have been engaged in the practice of his profession for at least 2 years subsequent to graduation. Appointments as chaplain shall be made from persons duly accredited by some religious denomination or organization, and of good standing therein, between the ages of 23 and 45 years."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 7, lines 12 and 13, strike out the words "during the current calendar year" and insert after the word "completed" the words "not less than."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. On and after July 1, 1939, the peacetime commissioned strength of the Regular Army to be attained by approximately equal annual increments, as hereinbefore provided, shall be 16,719 officers, including 67 general officers of the line as now authorized by law. Commissioned officers, other than general officers, shall be assigned to the several branches as follows: Infantry, 4,184; Cavalry, 1,034; Field Artillery, 1,726; Coast Artillery Corps, 1,341; Air Corps, 3,203; exclusive of officers detailed from other arms and services for training and duty as aircraft observers and other members of combat crews; Corps of Engineers, 795; Signal Corps, 341; Adjutant General's Department, 131; Judge Advocate General's Department, 121; Quartermaster Corps, 1,016; Finance Department, 176; Ordnance Department, 417; Chemical Warfare Service, 124; Medical Corps, 1,424; Dental Corps, 316; Veterinary Corps, 126; Medical Administrative Corps, 16; and Corps of Chaplains, 152: *Provided*, That the President may increase or diminish the number of officers assigned to any branch by not more than a total of 30 percent: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall affect the number of professors, United States Military Academy, as now authorized by law, or require the reparation from the service of any officer now commissioned in the Medical Administrative Corps. Subject to the authorized increase or decrease of 30 percent hereinabove provided, the number of officers detailed in the Inspector General's Department shall be 55.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARTER of Ohio: Page 10, line 5, after the word "three" where it occurs the second time in the line, strike out the semicolon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. The act approved June 11, 1938 (ch. 337, 75th Cong., 3d sess.), is hereby amended by striking out the words "twenty-one thousand five hundred" in the last line thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the words "forty-five thousand."

SEC. 10. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect the operation of the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028), with respect to the selection and commissioning, in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of that act, of Reserve officers now on active duty under the provisions of that act. Upon the effective date of this act, Air Corps Reserve officers who are then on active duty under the provisions of section 1 of the act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1524), shall be deemed to be on active duty under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That on and after the effective date of this act no Air Corps Reserve officers shall be called to active duty under the provision of section 1 of the said act of June 16, 1936. Except as otherwise herein provided, nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect the number of Reserve officers that may be called to active duty under existing laws, nor the conditions and the purposes for which they may be called.

SEC. 11. Section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1524), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Any Air Corps Reserve officer who has not been selected for commission in the Regular Army shall be paid upon release from active duty following the termination of any period of active duty of 3 years or more in duration a lump sum of \$500, which sum shall be in addition to any pay and allowances which he may otherwise be entitled to receive."

SEC. 12. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$23,750,000 to be expended for the construction, rehabilitation, and installation in the Panama Canal Department of such buildings, utilities, and appurtenances thereto as may be necessary to house antiaircraft, seacoast defense, and auxiliary units most urgently needed for defense of the Panama Canal.

SEC. 13. That section 4 of the act approved June 16, 1938, entitled "An act to provide for placing educational orders to familiarize private manufacturing establishments with the production of

munitions of war of special or technical design, noncommercial in character," be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. That funds appropriated to accomplish the purposes of this act shall be available for expenditures incidental to the accomplishment of the procurements made thereunder, including production studies, factory plans, and other production data and the storage and maintenance of gages, dies, jigs, tools, fixtures, and other special aids and appliances procured thereunder. To carry out the provisions of this act there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$34,500,000, which amount shall be available during the fiscal years 1939, 1940, and 1941, and there is further authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,000,000 during each of the 4 fiscal years succeeding the fiscal year 1941."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUDLOW: On page 13, after section 13, add a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 14. The United States would welcome and support an international conference for limitation of armaments and in the event of an agreement of the world powers to which the United States is signatory, providing for such a reduction of armaments, the President is hereby authorized and empowered to suspend so much of the program as it may be necessary to eliminate in order to conform to said agreement."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, it is the same identical provision, in substance, which was held in order on the naval expansion bill, introduced in the last session. It would seem that a provision that was in order on a naval expansion bill would also be in order on a military expansion bill. I fail to see that the proposal is not in order on this bill. I had hoped that the chairman of the committee would not raise the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of opinion that to the bill pending before the House to provide more effectively for the national defense, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana is not in order. The Chair is of opinion that the proposed amendment comes within the jurisdiction of another committee and is therefore not germane, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Under the rule the Committee will now rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3791) to provide more effectively for the national defense by carrying out the recommendations of the President in his message of January 12, 1939, to the Congress, and that in accordance with House Resolution No. 88 he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 367, nays 15, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—367

Alexander	Arnold	Beckworth	Bradley, Mich.
Allen, Ill.	Ashbrook	Bell	Bradley, Pa.
Allen, La.	Austin	Bender	Brewster
Allen, Pa.	Ball	Blackney	Brooks
Anderson, Calif.	Barden	Bland	Brown, Ga.
Anderson, Mo.	Barnes	Bloom	Brown, Ohio
Andersen, A. H.	Barry	Boehne	Bryson
Andrews	Barton	Boland	Buck
Angell	Bates, Ky.	Boren	Buckler, Minn.
Arends	Bates, Mass.	Boykin	Buckley, N. Y.

Bulwinkle	Gerlach	Ludlow	Rogers, Mass.
Burch	Geyer, Calif.	McAndrews	Rogers, Okla.
Burgin	Gibbs	McCormack	Romjue
Byrne, N. Y.	Gilchrist	McDowell	Routzohn
Byrns, Tenn.	Gillie	McGehee	Rutherford
Byron	Goldsborough	McGranery	Ryan
Caldwell	Gore	McKeough	Sabath
Cannon, Fla.	Gossett	McLaughlin	Sacks
Cannon, Mo.	Graham	McLean	Sandager
Carter	Grant, Ala.	McLeod	Satterfield
Cartwright	Grant, Ind.	McMillan, John L.	Schaefer, Ill.
Case, S. Dak.	Green	McMillan, Thos. S.	Schiffier
Casey, Mass.	Gregory	Maas	Schuetz
Celler	Griffith	Magnuson	Schulte
Chilperfield	Griswold	Mahon	Schwert
Church	Gross	Maloney	Scrugham
Clark	Guyer, Kans.	Marcan Antonio	Shafer, Mich.
Clason	Gwynne	Hall	Shanley
Claypool	Hancock	Marshall	Shannon
Clevenger	Hare	Martin, Colo.	Short
Cluett	Hare	Martin, Ill.	Simpson
Cochran	Harrington	Martin, Iowa	Sirovich
Coffee, Nebr.	Hart	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Conn.
Coffee, Wash.	Harter, N. Y.	Mason	Smith, Ill.
Cole, Md.	Harter, Ohio	Massingale	Smith, Maine
Colmer	Hartley	May	Smith, Ohio
Connery	Havenner	Merritt	Smith, Va.
Cooper	Hawks	Michener	Smith, Wash.
Costello	Healey	Miller	Smith, W. Va.
Cox	Heinke	Mills, Ark.	Snyder
Crawford	Hendricks	Mills, La.	Somers, N. Y.
Crosser	Hennings	Mitchell	South
Crowe	Hess	Monkiewicz	Sparkman
Crowther	Hill	Monrone	Spence
Culkin	Hinshaw	Moser	Springer
Cullen	Hobbs	Mott	Starnes, Ala.
Cummings	Horton	Mouton	Steagall
D'Alessandro	Hull	Mundt	Stearns, N. H.
Darrow	Hunter	Murdock, Ariz.	Stefan
Delaney	Izac	Murdock, Utah	Sumner, Ill.
Dempsey	Jacobsen	Myers	Sutphin
DeRouen	Jarman	Nelson	Sweeney
Dickstein	Jarrett	Nichols	Taber
Dies	Jeffries	Norrell	Talle
Dingell	Jenks, N. H.	Norton	Tarver
Disney	Jensen	O'Connor	Tenerowicz
Douglas	Johns	O'Day	Terry
Dowell	Johnson, Ill.	O'Leary	Thomas, N. J.
Doxey	Johnson, Ind.	Oliver	Thomas, Tex.
Drewry	Johnson, Luther A.	O'Neal	Thomason
Duncan	Johnson, Lyndon	Osmer	Thorkelson
Dunn	Johnson, Okla.	O'Toole	Tibbott
Durham	Johnson, W. Va.	Owen	Tinkham
Dworshak	Jones, Ohio	Pace	Tolan
Eaton, Calif.	Jones, Tex.	Parsons	Treadway
Eaton, N. J.	Kean	Patman	Turner
Eberharter	Kee	Patrick	Van Zandt
Edmiston	Keefe	Patton	Vincent, Ky.
Elliott	Keller	Pearson	Vinson, Ga.
Ellis	Kennedy, Martin	Peterson, Fla.	Voorhis, Calif.
Elston	Kennedy, Michael	Peterson, Ga.	Vorys, Ohio
Engel	Kennedy, Md.	Pfeiffer	Vreeland
Englebright	Keogh	Pierce, N. Y.	Wadsworth
Evans	Kerr	Pierce, Oreg.	Wallgren
Faddis	Kilday	Pittenger	Walter
Fenton	Kinzer	Piumley	Weaver
Ferguson	Kirwan	Poage	Welch
Fernandez	Kitchens	Polk	West
Fitzpatrick	Kleberg	Powers	Wheat
Flaherty	Kramer	Rabaut	Whelchel
Flannagan	Kunkel	Ramspeck	White, Idaho
Flannery	Landis	Randolph	Whittington
Folger	Lanham	Rankin	Wigglesworth
Ford, Leland M.	Larrabee	Rayburn	Williams, Mo.
Ford, Miss.	Lea	Reece, Tenn.	Wolcott
Fries	Leavy	Reed, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gamble	LeCompte	Reed, N. Y.	Wood
Garrett	Lesinski	Richards	Woodruff, Mich.
Gartner	Lewis, Colo.	Risk	Woodrum, Va.
Gathings	Lewis, Ohio	Robertson	Youngdahl
Gavagan	Lord	Robinson, Utah	Zimmerman
Gehrmann	Luce	Rodgers, Pa.	

NAYS—15

Andersen, H. Carl	Curtis	Lambertson	Rich
Bolles	Hope	Lemke	Rockefeller
Burdick	Houston	Murray	Thill
Carlson	Knutson	Rees, Kans.	

NOT VOTING—50

Beam	Ditter	Hook	Seger
Bolton	Dondero	Jenkins, Ohio	Sheppard
Chandler	Doughton	Kelly	Sullivan
Chapman	Fay	Kocialewski	Summers, Tex.
Cole, N. Y.	Fish	McArdle	Taylor, Colo.
Collins	Ford, Thomas F.	McReynolds	Taylor, Tenn.
Cooley	Fulmer	Maciejewski	Warren
Corbett	Gearhart	Mansfield	White, Ohio
Creal	Gifford	O'Brien	Williams, Del.
Curley	Halleck	Robson, Ky.	Winter
Daly	Harness	Schaefer, Wis.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Darden	Hoffman	Secombe	
Dirksen	Holmes	Secrest	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
General pairs:

Mr. Warren with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Holmes.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Robson of Kentucky.
Mr. McReynolds with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Secombe.
Mr. Collins with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio.
Mr. Darden with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Chandler with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Harness.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Seger.
Mr. Fay with Mr. White of Ohio.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Curley with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Daly with Mr. Schaefer of Wisconsin.
Mr. Thomas F. Ford with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Kocialewski with Mr. Williams of Delaware.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Maciejewski.
Mr. McArdle with Mr. Gifford.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, four of the Members from Illinois, due to important business, are absent. If they were present, they would have voted "aye" on the bill. Those gentlemen are: Mr. BEAM, Mr. KELLY, Mr. MACIEJEWSKI, and Mr. KOCIALEKOWSKI.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. MANSFIELD, is unavoidably absent. Had he been present when this vote was taken, he would have voted "aye."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. CHAPMAN, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would have voted "aye" on this roll call.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Messrs. JENKINS, SECCOMBE, DONDERO, BOLTON, DITTER, WHITE of Ohio, WOLFENDEN, HARNES, CORBETT, DIRKSEN, HOLMES, HOFFMAN, and GIFFORD, are unavoidably absent, either through illness or on account of business. Had they been present they would have voted "aye" on the passage of the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short resolution from the Common Council of Oneonta, N. Y., which contains about 17 lines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, to include a letter on our foreign relations which I have received from the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 8—which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 8

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the first paragraph of House Concurrent Resolution 4 of the Seventy-sixth Congress is hereby amended to read as follows: "That in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the First Congress of the United States under the Constitution, begun and held at the city of New York on Wednesday, the 4th of March 1789, the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 12 o'clock meridian on Saturday, March 4, 1939."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD to include an address which I delivered this afternoon at the United States battleship *Maine* memorial services, held at Fort Myer, Va., under the auspices of the United Spanish War Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD two statements which I made in support of the bill (H. R. 2) before the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a speech I made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a resolution from the National Student Legislative Council.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, February 17, 1939, immediately after the reading of the Journal and disposition of other matters on the Speaker's desk, I be privileged to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a Lincoln Day address by the Governor of South Dakota before the National Republican Club of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including in the Appendix an address by my colleague, Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, Representative from the State of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave of absence be granted to my colleague, Hon. JOSEPH A. McARDLE, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes. I have asked the permission of the gentlemen who have special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is that agreeable to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON]?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is agreeable to me, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. That is agreeable to me, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. KINZER), for 1 week, on account of illness in his family;

To Mr. THOMAS F. FORD, for the balance of the week on account of illness.

DIRECT RELIEF AND WORK RELIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULLEN). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] for 2 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, 8 days have elapsed since the President of the United States requested an additional \$150,000,000 for the Works Progress Administration. Only 44 days remain before approximately 2,000,000 people on the W. P. A. will be laid off.

The overwhelming majority of the American people demand action. Why is it that the Appropriations Committee is not acting on this request which is so vital to the welfare not only of the unemployed of this country but so vital to the welfare of the entire Nation? Why is it that the committee indulges in this delay? There can be no alibi or excuse for any delay. We face an emergency. The President stated in his message, "I ask that the Congress commence immediate consideration of these simple and alarming facts." Immediate consideration means now and not a month from now; today and not tomorrow.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not see any member of the majority on the Appropriations Committee here at the moment, but I may say in fairness to them that the President said he would report to the Congress again the first week in March. This would give the Appropriations Committee plenty of time to make an additional appropriation for the 3 remaining months until July 1 if they so desire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous special order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] for 30 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, now that the committee presided over by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DRES] has been reorganized and is ready to proceed with its work, I deem it my duty to address this House on the subject of the committee and on what I consider would be the important angles of inquiry to be pursued by it.

A few days ago, along with other Members of the House, I had occasion to speak of the work of the committee and its record up to that time, which was by no means inspiring. I then saw fit to point out some of its shortcomings, not by way of destructive criticism but by way of constructive suggestions as to how the committee might best serve the interests of the country.

After all, this is a committee of the House of Representatives, and all of us owe a duty to this House as well as to the country at large, a duty which must be discharged in an honest, straightforward, and patriotic manner, and I have no fear that a few suggestions might go a long way toward the achievement of that object.

It is unnecessary for me to tell you in detail as to my particular reasons for being so vitally concerned in the success of the committee's work. After all, the committee is my brain child and far back in 1933, when most of the Members of this House did not even know or suspect the existence of foreign propaganda, it was I, as chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, together with eight members of that committee, who undertook to make a thorough study of this situation. After holding hearings during the recess of Congress, we obtained enough evidence

to focus the attention of the country upon the existing menace of foreign propaganda. It was only after earnest pleading with the Members of the House that I finally succeeded, on March 20, 1934, in obtaining the appointment of a committee to investigate subversive propaganda in the United States. This committee was created by House Resolution No. 198, reading as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint a special committee to be composed of seven Members for the purpose of conducting an investigation of (1) the extent, character, and objects of Nazi propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

That said special committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States—whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned—to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, by subpoena or otherwise, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpena shall be issued under the signature of the chairman and shall be served by any person designated by him. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives was authorized to appoint this special committee, and the then Speaker, the Honorable Henry T. Rainey, who is now deceased, promptly communicated with me urging me to accept the chairmanship of that committee. I declined this honor, feeling that my work would best be done if another Member of the House were to be selected as the chairman of that committee, and the Speaker thereupon appointed the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] as such chairman. I was made a member of the committee and elected the vice chairman thereof. It was then that this committee conducted a very intensive and thoroughgoing investigation with a very small appropriation, \$30,000. Very carefully, prudently, and without undue publicity, the committee then pursued its task of obtaining for the benefit of this House and the country at large the knowledge of such facts as would enable the House of Representatives to pass remedial legislation to do away with subversive propaganda.

The situation was very serious. From the right and from the left pressure was brought on the American public to do away with our time-honored democracy and to reorganize our constitutional set-up by way of fascism or communism. The pressure from the right and the pressure from the left was beating on our democracy, and the business depression which had then been in existence for a number of years made this country a fertile ground for the reception of foreign "isms." It was at this stage of the world's affairs that our committee set itself the task to educate the people of our country to the dangers of intolerance and hatred. We tried to make the people realize that intolerance and bigotry could not help to lift us out of our depression, but on the contrary, would result in a feeling of suspicion and distrust engendered against our fellow citizens and ultimately would bring about a cleavage and division among the members of our citizenry which could bode no good to the continuance of our democratic institutions. Our investigation was conducted along constructive lines and we prepared a report which showed the dangers of both fascism and communism to the continuance of our democratic institutions. We did not subpoena *ex parte* investigators, but subpoenaed James Ford, Browder, and other Communist leaders. We did not slander or attack the reputation of prominent Americans without having any definite evidence as to their guilt. May I suggest that the Dies committee follow this line of procedure? It certainly does not enhance the reputation of the committee, nor does it result in having the committee held in esteem, if it attacks the officials of our home Govern-

ment and criticizes the conduct of our public officials who are doing their best to help eradicate from our midst any insidious attempts at the destruction of our form of government. We surely do not want to give aid and comfort to the enemy by attacking our own public officials. If the object of the committee is to show the dangers of foreign propaganda, let us not unnecessarily involve officials of our own Government who are the living exponents of our own democratic form of government.

In addition to foreign organizations, to which I will refer again in a moment, let me at this time briefly mention some of our domestic organizations which are as obnoxious to the maintenance of our democracy as are foreign groups working toward the same aim, that is to array citizen against citizen, or one group, one religion, one class, or one race against another. Among these dangerous and malignant groups are some 120 organizations. The committee presided over by the gentleman from Texas says there are some 60. A superficial examination of these organizations shows the diversity of the elements composing the sources of the assault upon our democracy. There are, as I said before, elements of the right as well as of the left, there are equally obnoxious and equally a necessary subject for investigation by this committee.

In addition to these organizations there are other sources of subversive activities in the United States. There are subversive groups of alien origin working in our navy yards, in our National Guard, and among the contractors employed by the agencies of our Government in the manufacture of munitions, airplanes and other scientific instruments. Those are the groups which seek to sabotage naval and military plans in the event this country should be drawn into war. Those are the groups which seek to obtain information about our national resources and our military and naval equipment. Those are the groups which communicate to foreign governments the result of their espionage activities.

The committee until the present time has not in any way submitted to the attention of the public any of these facts, nor has the committee made a study of the vast possibilities of destruction which face us if the activities of spies and saboteurs are allowed to go unchecked. For they eventually may result in another Black Tom or Kingsland explosion.

In March of last year one of my investigators made a study of the situation prevailing in the National Guard of the State of New York and found that there was a large number of aliens, both of German and of Russian origin, serving in the ranks of our State militia. It was with the cooperation of the Governor of the State of New York, to whose attention this matter was brought, that within 24 hours after advising the Governor about it an order was issued discharging from service every alien then serving in our National Guard, and requiring that hereafter only citizens should be eligible for service in our State militia. This is an instance of prompt official action when the facts were brought to the attention of the proper authority of our Government. It is such prompt action which should be imitated by this committee, and undoubtedly results will be just as effective. I do not know how many States in the Union suffer from the same situation at the present time, but perhaps a little activity on the part of the committee will ascertain the facts and cause the respective Governors of other States to take action similar to that heretofore taken by the Governor of my own State.

The German steamship lines have established a thorough system of bringing into this country tons of material used for vicious antidemocratic propaganda against our President, officials of our Government, and many groups of our citizens. This propaganda emanates from a totalitarian country, and the committee has done nothing to ascertain its sources or to stop its further operation. There are also uniforms for storm troopers, youth groups, and other totalitarian organizations being shipped on these boats, but nothing has been done by the committee to ascertain the origin of this type of propaganda. There are also books which have been withdrawn from circulation in this country because of their vicious

and un-American character, only to be reprinted in Berlin and other places and to be sent back to us on German boats. This has likewise been ignored by the committee and not been investigated.

I take it for granted, or at least wish to express my hope that when the committee resumes its activities it will make a thorough study of the so-called German-American Bund, and that it will ascertain its objects, purposes, manner of organization, and particularly the source of its funds. It is unthinkable that out of the meager contributions levied on German merchants in this country it should be possible to manage a totalitarian organization like the bund which not only keeps up a network of activities stretching from coast to coast, but also embraces the North American Continent from Canada to Mexico. These bunds maintain over 30 camps in various parts of the United States, camps which are nothing but the training grounds for military drills and for the organization of a private army in opposition to and contrary to our own Army and Navy. To permit a foreign group to maintain an army on our own soil is, to say the least, the height of complacency. We surely cannot permit such unchecked activity, and it will be up to the committee to make a thorough study of this phase of foreign activities.

There are also chemical laboratories to manufacture noxious gasses and bombs for the destruction of our Army and Navy. There are secret laboratories, to work out dangerous processes, conducted by men who had experience in the chemical-warfare service of other nations and who wish to utilize that experience against our citizens.

There are exchange students who ostensibly come to this country to study, but are really here to indulge in widespread propaganda against our democracy as has been more fully discussed by me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 5, 1939. There are activities of a more insidious kind, which, taking advantage of diplomatic immunity enjoyed by consuls, center around the various consulates of foreign nations. Would an American consul in any foreign country be permitted to appear on the public platform and speak against the form of government of the country to which he has been accredited? And yet that is precisely what German consuls have been doing from time to time and are still doing. They appear on the public platform and openly, because we cherish the ideal of free speech, tell our citizens that our Government is no good.

I do not have to dwell too long on the spy activities which recently resulted in a series of convictions meted out in the city of New York, as well as in our Canal Zone, after an impartial judicial trial. But did the trial stop these activities? On the contrary, in the Canal Zone the German consul was brazen enough to denounce the processes of our American justice and to criticize our officials for doing their duty.

There has been a noticeable change in methods of propaganda in recent years. While in former years it was the practice of propagandists to be vociferous, and the tactics they used to convert the public was to be shouting from the housetops, today their methods are more insidious. The idea is to drop a hint here and there, to whisper a remark here and there, and to cause dissatisfaction and unhappiness wherever possible. A propagandist can only fish in muddy waters, and agitators who become experts in their field make it hard for us to find a proper method to combat their activities. For the guidance of the committee may I add that most of this propaganda originates in countries already committed to a Fascist ideology, but an important part comes from countries that have democratic governments. There are Irish, Swiss, Swedish, French, and other foreign groups that are carrying on through Nazi inspiration and assistance anti-democratic and anti-Semitic propaganda. Ukrainian organizations of the pro-Nazi variety are active here, as well as Japanese societies which are spreading pro-Nazi propaganda. Among other organizations to be mentioned here are the Arab Racial League, the Palestine-Arab Delegation, the Gold Shirts of Mexico, which organization carries on anti-Semitic propaganda not only in Mexico but also among the Mexicans in the United States, and several White Russian organiza-

tions lined up with the Nazis, namely, the Russian National Union, White Guard Russian troops, Russian National League of America, and the Ancient and Noble Order of the Blue Lamoo. There are also several Canadian groups active in spreading pro-Nazi and anti-Semitic propaganda not only in Canada but in the United States as well. Among them are the Montreal Women's Anti-Communist League, the Canadian Nationalist Party, the Thunderbolt, Canadian Union of Fascists, and similar organizations.

Among the English organizations operating in the United States from England are: British Union of Fascists and National Socialists, Boswell Publishing Co., Britons Publishing Co., Christian Aryan Protection League, Imperial Fascist League, Militant Christian Patriots, and the Universal Racial Alliance.

Fascist Italy, too, is carrying on a vigorous propaganda in the United States today and the Italian consuls and the Italian press in this country have been forced to join in this campaign. For example, there are such organizations as the American Italian Union, Italian Library of Information, the Lictor Federation, successor to the Fascist League of America. The Italian Historical Society, the Dante Alighieri Society, and the Italian Black Shirts.

Of course Nazi Germany, too, has set up numerous organizations, the purpose of which is to propagandize the United States. In addition to the travel and steamship agencies, the German consuls, the press correspondents, and the news agencies of Nazi Germany active in spreading pro-Nazi and antidemocratic and antisemitic propaganda, there are also the following organizations operating in the United States from Nazi Germany: Institute of Germans Living Abroad, the foreign organizations of the labor front, the foreign political office under Dr. Alfred Rosenberg, the People's League for Germanism Abroad, Nordic Society, German Colonial Society, Aryan Christian Alliance, Institute for the Study of the Jewish Question, German Students' Foreign District, Hitler Youth, Anti-Jewish World League, Anti-Comintern League, Fichte Bund, World Service, Julius Streicher's world clearing house for Jew-baiting, Nuremberg, Germany, Judenkenner.

Nazi Germany also has set up in the United States numerous organizations composed of German citizens and American citizens of German extraction, to carry on the Nazi propaganda campaign. Naturally these overlap in their activities. Among them all there is the closest cooperation and Fritz Kuhn, head of the German-American Bund, successor to the Friends of the New Germany, seems to direct the activities of all of them. Among these organizations now active or recently active are: Order of Service (American storm troopers), League of German Girls, German-American Business League, the Steel Helmets, German Veterans' League, German Legion, German Edda Culture League, German Commonwealth for Art and Literature (with the storm troop and political divisions).

But there are also numerous native American organizations that are carrying on antidemocratic, antisemitic, and pro-Nazi propaganda in the United States. They are national, regional, and local, though most of them are local or regional in character. There are also churches, usually German churches or Fundamentalists, that are centers of such propaganda. In defending the Fatherland, German churches naturally fall into the Nazi propaganda set-up and along with the defense of the Fatherland the German churches usually exploit antisemitic propaganda and thus lend very definite aid and comfort to the Nazi propagandists in the United States.

The other churches involved in this antisemitic and pro-Nazi propaganda are usually of the Fundamentalist variety extremely orthodox and reactionary in their theological views. In general, they say that the coming of Jesus is imminent. However, before he comes, the anti-Christ must come. Their further reasoning is that anti-Christ has come in the form of Jewish communism or Soviet atheism, both of which are synonymous, and that Hitler is the great bulwark against that anti-Christ. Thus they find themselves in

the Nazi propaganda camp. There are several hundred important churches in the class of antisemitic propagandists in the United States, besides several thousand smaller ones that preach antisemitism intermittently.

There are also many individuals who act as centers of propaganda. These individuals act through and for other organizations, distribute literature of numerous groups, and send in the names of prospective victims of Nazi propaganda to both foreign and native propaganda groups. These individuals, of whom there are a great many, are very important agents of subversive propaganda. There is scarcely a community of any size without at least one of these individual propagandists.

Also, there are a good many important so-called patriotic groups and reactionary economic groups that might be classed as marginal. They believe themselves to be genuinely patriotic, but when a serious crisis arises they often find themselves in the pro-Nazi and anti-Semitic camp. Also, many of these reactionary, economic, and so-called patriotic groups exploit the propaganda furnished by regular anti-Semitic organizations. Types of individuals and organizations represented in these groups have been classified as antialien, antidemocratic, antilabor, anti-Negro, anti New Deal, anti-pacifist, anti-Catholic, and vigilante, but all of them pro-Nazi and anti-Semitic.

With few exceptions all of these organizations have come into existence since Hitler came to power, and whether innocently or not they are all therefore agents of Hitler in the United States.

As a friend of the committee I must earnestly warn them that their task will not be an easy one. It will require a high degree of statesmanship and real ability to unearth some of the propaganda which does not squarely meet the eye. I am sure that the committee will be able to find complete cooperation whenever it will direct its energies to the eradication of dangerous propaganda. The press has been very helpful, and the Members of this body will give their assistance whenever called upon. We must not, however, let our vigilance relax. We must be forever mindful of our duty to this House as well as the people of the United States and perform our tasks with ability, dispatch, and dignity. The committee has an adequate appropriation, and no reason exists why it could not provide itself with an efficient and well-trained staff to assist it in its work. Its investigators should be chosen for their ability to obtain real information and to present all of the necessary facts to the committee for its action. The committee should guard against the type of investigators who are men of little knowledge and less ability, men who repeat hearsay without taking the trouble to check facts, for very often it is this type of investigator that may be held responsible for the failure of a committee to secure important information.

I am presenting the matter now to the Congress of the United States for the benefit and guidance of the Dies committee, and I assure the committee that if they will follow the suggestions made in this carefully prepared document, they will have sufficient evidence to expose the agitators who seek to undermine the Government.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. The gentleman indicated that the list of names covered 120 different organizations which should be investigated.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There are 120 such organizations in the United States. They call themselves 200 percenters; yet they practice and preach intolerance and hatred amongst the citizens of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. What good purpose is served by not putting those additional 120 names into the Record so that the world may know, rather than make the list a confidential communication?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For the simple reason that I want the committee to have the opportunity of using this list for the purpose of subpoena and obtaining some of their records. The moment I put the names of those 120 organizations into

the Record the most important evidence would disappear, because those groups are clever enough to destroy some of their incriminating records. I have incorporated in my statement now, however, names of some subversive organizations and their activities in the United States, which must be exposed if we desire to preserve our democracy.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I appreciate the work the gentleman has been doing throughout the years, and I want to take this opportunity of congratulating him upon this splendid work and for his cooperation, because I know that his intimate knowledge of the subject will make the success of the Dies committee more assured.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] now has everything he has asked for, an extension of his committee, sufficient funds for an efficient staff, and the cooperation of the House of Representatives. There is no earthly reason why he should not succeed in his endeavor and we all hope that he will accomplish the great and important task of ridding our country of all groups organized for the purpose of undermining our liberal form of government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON] yields back his time. He does not desire to address the House at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona and Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the Record.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record by printing in the Record a speech delivered in a previous session of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 16, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Public hearings will continue Thursday, February 16, 1939, at 10 a. m., on social-security legislation, in the Ways and Means Committee room in the New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Thursday, February 16, 1939. Business to be considered: Continuation of hearing on H. R. 2531—transportation bill. Mr. John N. Beall, a representative of the American Trucking Association, will be the witness.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on Thursday, February 16, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., for the purpose of continuing the consideration of H. R. 2880, "To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," carrying out partially the recommendations of the Hepburn report.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, February 16, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to consider H. R. 2184, H. R. 2317, H. R. 2957, H. R. 2958, H. R. 2959, H. R. 2960.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Thursday, February 16, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., to hold hearings on the

report on Calumet-Sag Channel, Ill., and Indiana Harbor and Canal, Ind.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in room 213, House Office Building, Thursday, February 16, 1939, at 10 a. m., for the public consideration of H. R. 3230.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10 a. m. Tuesday, February 21, 1939, on the bill (H. R. 3576) to make effective the provisions of the Officers' Competency Certificates Convention, 1936.

It is contemplated that the hearing on Tuesday, February 21, 1939, on H. R. 3576 will deal particularly with legislation necessary to make effective the provisions of the treaty and problems arising in connection with the provisions of the treaty.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10 a. m., on the bills and dates listed below:

Tuesday, March 14, 1939:

H. R. 180, H. R. 202, construction of a Nicaraguan Canal; H. R. 201, additional facilities for Panama Canal; H. R. 2667, construction of a Mexican Canal.

In listing the bills to be heard on March 14, 1939, House Joint Resolution 112 (TINKHAM), to create a commission to study and report on the feasibility of constructing the Mexican Canal, was inadvertently omitted from the notice.

This is to advise all interested parties that House Joint Resolution 112 will be considered at that time with the following bills: H. R. 180 (IZAC), relative to the construction of a Nicaraguan Canal; H. R. 202 (BLAND), relative to the construction of a Nicaraguan Canal; H. R. 201 (BLAND), need for additional lock facilities at Panama; H. R. 2667 (TINKHAM), relative to the construction of a Mexican Canal.

Tuesday, March 21, 1939:

H. R. 137, H. R. 980, H. R. 1674, relating to annuities for Panama Canal construction force.

Thursday, March 23, 1939:

H. R. 139, H. R. 141, H. R. 142, H. R. 1819, miscellaneous Panama Canal bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

421. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, for the Treasury Department to provide for payment to Federal land banks on account of the reduction in interest rate on mortgages under the provisions of the act of July 16, 1938, in the amount of \$10,250,000 (H. Doc. No. 154); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

422. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize payment of certain unpaid Creek equalization claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

423. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of June 30, 1936, providing for the administration and maintenance of the Blue Ridge Highway; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 950. A bill to exempt from the provisions of Draft Convention No. 53 of the International Labor Conference Treaty of 1936 all American vessels under

200 tons; with amendment (Rept. No. 41). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANSFIELD: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Senate Joint Resolution 57. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to cause a completion of surveys, test borings, and foundation investigations to be made to determine the advisability and cost of putting in a small experimental plant for development of tidal power in the waters in and about Passamaquoddy Bay, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such examinations; with amendment (Rept. No. 42). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4166. A bill prohibiting the importation of the United States flag or emblem from foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4167. A bill to extend further time for naturalization of alien veterans of ineligible race who served in the armed forces of the United States during the World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 4168. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of certain rivers and their tributaries on the island of Kauai, T. H., for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 4169. A bill to provide for the sale of certain arms to war veterans' organizations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 4170. A bill to prevent the pollution of the navigable waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4171 (by request). A bill to authorize the President to bestow a meritorious-service medal upon civil officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4172. A bill to provide for deportation of certain aliens who do not make declaration of intention to become citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4173. A bill to establish the Department of Military Defense, to limit the activities of the military establishments to defense purpose only, to make such establishments instruments of national peace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LAMBERTSON:

H. R. 4174. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to grant a revocable license to the Union Pacific Railroad Co. to maintain certain railroad trackage on the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGLESIAS:

H. R. 4175. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to build an American Army monument in Mayaguez, P. R.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4176. A bill for a survey and examination of Punta Santiago Harbor, Fajardo, P. R.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4177. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Tombigbee Post, No. 69, of the American Legion, Columbus, Miss., of the old post-office building and the site thereof in such city; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 4178. A bill to provide for loans to farmers on first mortgage at a 3-percent interest rate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4179. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorative of the four hundredth anniversary of the expedition of Hernando de Soto; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4180 (by departmental request). A bill to repeal section 9 of the act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. L. 450), as amended; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri:

H. R. 4181. A bill to amend section 14 of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1069), entitled the "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938"; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H. R. 4182. A bill to allow credits against the tax imposed by section 901 of the Social Security Act for the calendar year 1937 for certain contributions to State unemployment funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 4183. A bill to amend an act approved December 17, 1928, entitled d"An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment thereon in claims which the Winnebago Tribe of Indians in Wisconsin may have against the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 4184. A bill to authorize the conveyance by the United States to the town of Bristol, Maine, of a portion of the Pemaquid Point Lighthouse Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. D'ALESSANDRO:

H. R. 4185. A bill to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 4186. A bill to adjust benefits under war-risk insurance policies in cases of specific disabilities; to the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4187. A bill to designate United States Highway No. 6 as the "Grand Army of the Republic Highway"; to the Committee on Roads.

H. R. 4188. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in or near the city of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4189. A bill to provide national flags for the burials of honorably discharged former service men and women; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4190. A bill to permit classification of certain unclassified employees of the United States by noncompetitive examinations; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

H. R. 4191. A bill to provide annuities for widows of retired civil-service employees of the United States and District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4192. A bill to impose a tax upon imported bread; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution proposing a plan for the adjustment of the claim of the State of Oklahoma against the United States arising from the tax exemption of Indian lands and the products thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution to amend Public Resolution No. 112, Seventy-fifth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. Res. 95. Resolution to authorize payment of expenses of Select Committee on Government Organization authorized by House Resolution 60; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution No. 14, concerning the multiple-use development of the White River Basin in Arkansas and Missouri; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALL:

H. R. 4193. A bill for the relief of Desiderio Mazzella; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BOEHNE:

H. R. 4194. A bill granting a pension to Lola Frances Sumner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H. R. 4195. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Orr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 4196. A bill granting a pension to Belle Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 4197. A bill granting a pension to Jennie Zimmerman; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 4198. A bill for the relief of M. L. Parish; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLUETT:

H. R. 4199. A bill granting an increase of pension to Pearl F. Pratt; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 4200. A bill granting an increase of pension to Anna Belle La Fay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRIES:

H. R. 4201. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 4202. A bill for the relief of Fred T. Gordon and Bert N. Richardson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4203. A bill for the relief of William H. Harris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4204. A bill granting an increase of pension to Minnie Wetmore Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4205. A bill for the relief of Aloha Motors, Ltd.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEOD:

H. R. 4206. A bill granting a pension to Walter B. Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 4207. A bill for the relief of Henrietta Vendemmia; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MASSINGALE:

H. R. 4208. A bill granting a pension to Carolyn M. Clawges; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

H. R. 4209. A bill for the relief of the heirs of the late George L. Lawrence; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4210. A bill for the relief of Oliver Ellison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4211. A bill for the relief of Homer H. Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 4212. A bill granting a pension to Chanley C. Freeman; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 4213. A bill for the relief of William Taft (deceased); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4214. A bill granting a pension to William Allen Estep; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ROUTZOHN:

H. R. 4215. A bill for the relief of George E. Kinner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 4216. A bill for the relief of Berthel Christopher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TIBBOTT:

H. R. 4217. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kochinich; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1115. By Mr. BREWSTER: Petition signed by 320 citizens of Orono, Maine, protesting against the discharge of citizens from Works Progress Administration projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1116. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the City Council of the City of Alameda, Calif., protesting against the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution No. 24 relative to the ownership of tidelands in the State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1117. Also, petition of the City Council of Richmond, Calif., urging a continuation of an appropriation for Works Progress Administration and Public Works Administration work to provide funds to meet the needs of the unemployed and to do the necessary work of public improvement; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1118. Also, Resolution No. 7 of the California State Legislature, memorializing the Congress to enact legislation to secure all aged citizens against want or poverty by means of a system of Federal old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1119. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of El Cerrito, Calif., urging the enactment of legislation to provide funds to meet needs of the unemployed and to carry on the work of necessary public improvements when present funds are exhausted; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1120. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Resolution passed by South Dakota Woman's Temperance Union, of Rapid City, S. Dak., petitioning Congress to pass legislation to prevent advertising of alcoholic beverages by press and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1121. Also, House concurrent resolution passed by the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress to appropriate funds under Farm Forestry Acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1122. Also, concurrent resolution passed by the Legislature of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress to enact such legislation that will enable our farmers and stockmen to be self-sustaining and able to repossess their homes and property; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1123. Also, Concurrent Resolution No. 5 of the South Dakota Senate, memorializing Congress of the United States to make the appropriation authorized in the Hayden-Cartwright act for construction and maintenance of highways within Indian reservations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1124. By Mr. FULMER: Resolution submitted by T. H. Cribb, manager, South Carolina Peach Growers' Association, Spartanburg, S. C., and the directors of the South Carolina Peach Growers' Association assembled in a meeting in Spartanburg, S. C., on Saturday, February 11, 1939, at 11 o'clock a. m., requesting that they go on record as opposed to all punitive and discriminatory legislation, either State or National, that will tend to reduce our incomes and add to the consumer's food costs by taking away any system of food distribution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1125. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, concerning congressional regulation of freight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1126. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, concerning repeal of Silver Purchase Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1127. By Mr. KERR: Petition of the North Carolina State Senate; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1128. By Mr. SCHAEFER of Illinois: Petition of the Fairmount Smelters Workers, Local No. 82, International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelters Workers, Joseph Verdu, secretary, East St. Louis, Ill., opposing amendments to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

1129. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mitchell Carbide & Light Co., Kimball, S. Dak., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1130. Also, petition of certain citizens of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1939

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, with whom is no mutability or changing shade, no night or winter, no ebbing tide: We bow before Thee at this morning hour, knowing that we, the children of time and sense, are stained by childish faults and petty sins, while Thy holiness and perfection transcend all human thought.

As Thou hast made us restless among the things we see, longing for the higher things, we beseech Thee to forgive whatever is amiss in these poor lives of ours; and do Thou teach us never to neglect the task of today because we cannot see its eternal effect, nor the little duties which are training us for an ever greater stewardship.

May we always remember that this life of ours has been divinely lived and that this robe of flesh and strange infirmity has been Thy garment to help us to live as sons of God and to walk worthy of our vocation in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 13, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Downey	La Follette	Schwartz
Andrews	Ellender	Lee	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Frazier	Lodge	Sheppard
Austin	George	Logan	Shipstead
Bailey	Gerry	Lucas	Smathers
Bankhead	Gibson	Lundeen	Smith
Barbour	Gillette	McKellar	Stewart
Barkley	Glass	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Bilbo	Green	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Bone	Guffey	Mead	Tobey
Brown	Gurney	Miller	Townsend
Bulow	Hale	Minton	Truman
Burke	Harrison	Murray	Tydings
Byrd	Hatch	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hayden	Norris	Van Nuys
Capper	Herring	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Hill	Overton	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Holman	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Holt	Pittman	White
Connally	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wiley
Danaher	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Donahay	King	Russell	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent on important public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.